DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTER

WTO Negotiations at its Sixth Ministerial Conference at Hong Kong

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI KAMAL NATH): Sir, the Commerce and Trade Ministers of 148 WTO member countries are scheduled to meet at Hong Kong from 13-18 December, 2005 to discuss and negotiate on the Doha work programme (also called the Doha Development Agenda) and July Framework Agreement of 2004.

[*MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair*]

Members of the House would recall that I had made a statement in this House in August, 2004 after the framework agreement was negotiated.

Somce then, there have been constant negotiations at the official as well as at ministerial levels India has been proactive in its participation in the negotiations in the WTO. India has participated in various formal and informal meetings not only for highlighting our developmental concerns, but also submitted a series of proposals on various issues. The proposals submitted are on issues of concern to India and also other developing countries.

India is a member of various coalitions and groups with common interest in issues under negotiations. India is a member of the G-20, which has been at the forefront to bring about a more equitable order in agriculture. India is also a member of G-33, a group of 44 developing countries that focuses on special and differential treatment for developing countries to address their food security livelihood security and rural developmental needs. India has been closely workly with important groupings, such as Africa Group, LDCs an ACP (Africa, Caribean and Pacific) countries. I have attended meetings of the ACP Group and the G-90, to coordinate our positions in the common interest of development countrues. Only last week, I attended the meeting of the G-90 Ministers at Brussels and and a meeting of G-4 at Geneva.

In non-agricultural market access negotiations, India has cosponsored a proposal with Brazil an Argantina, and also co-authored with 8 other developing countries, namely Argentina, Brazil, sough Africa, Pakistan, Namibia, Indonesia, Phillippines and Venezueula, a paper that highlights the need for a 'development focus' in all aspects of the Doha negotiations.

India, along with a number of developing countries including, the group of Mega-Diverse countries, has sought amendment in the TRIPS

Agreement for including "disclosure requirements" in the patents applications to prevent piracy of biological material, and misappropriation of traditional knowledge. Bio-piracy and misappropriation seriously affects the develpmental benefits, environmental Benefits,and the economic benefits of the poor and under-privieged community, who are holders of biological material and associated Traditional knowledge. We want that granting of patents on products out of the biological material and processes, based on Traditonal knowledge, should not over look the interests if the holders of such biological material and knowledge as that undermines the prospects of conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and prospects of conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and associated Traditional Knowledge as that undermines the prospects of conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and assoicated Traditional Knowledge. Disclosure of the source and country of origin of the biological resources and traditional knowledge in the patent applications, along with prior informed consent and equitable benefit sharing, would be a fair and equitable way to address the shortcomings in the TRIPS Agreement.

On the Singapore issues, India is a member of the core group which was instrumental in ensuring that the issures of investment, competition policy and transparency in government procurement were dropped from the potentially has a developmental dimension.

In the Services negotiations, India co-chairs with US, a core group of 14 countries which was set up to give momentum to the Service negotiations which are of importance to India considering that 52 per cent of India's GDP comes from the services sector.

For the Doha negotiations, extensive preparatory measures have been undertaken to finalise India's position on various issues in the WTO-positions that reflect both the domestic consensus on issues and that which best protect our interest. The domestic preparatory process has included wide ranging inter-ministerial and inter- departmental discussions. Inter- departmental delegations have been paricipating in the actual negotiations at Geneva as well as at other centres. Discussions have been conducted with the State Government though regular information sharing and infomation gather meetings. Workshops and semiars have been held in various cities in India on the ongoing negotiations.

For analytical back up, various academic and research institutions were identified early on and asked to carry out research studies. This has helped create Centres of excellence on specific WTO issues.The inputs from the studies conducts by these institutions and reports received from various other organisations have been used for formulating India's proposals. We

have also held wide stakeholder consultations with business operatives, farmer groups, industry associations and civil society. These have been held together with a large number of organisations/NGOs working in the field on these issues. These meetings have been informative as well as educative.

Finally, we have ensured that the Parliament and all parties are fully kept informed about these negotiations. I have met my colleagues from different potical parties to brief them, about the issues invloved in the negotiations.

Coming to India's position on the issues under negotiations, the most important sector is agriculture. As far as India is concerned, agriculture is not commerce for a vast majority of Indian farmers, it is a matter of livelihood for millions of India and their interests are to be fully protected. Members are aware that agriculture is the most structurally imbalanced among all the trading sectors, primarily, due to the huge subsidies given to the farmers/agri business in the developed world. In this round, it has been agreed that all export subsidies in agriculture would be eliminated; only the end date is to the negotiated. India's priority is to obtain substantial reduction of trade and distoring subsidies and domestic support by the developed countries. The G-20 has put forward its position *inter alia* indicating that the overall trade distorting support is reduced by 83 per cent highlighting the importance of agriculture. The G-20 has also stated that developed countries should cut their tariff by at least 54 per cent of their bound rates on average, and that developing countries should not have to cut more than two thirds of what the developed countries do. In addition, appropriate provisions to safeguard food security, livelihood security and rural development needs would be obtained through designation of an appropriate number of special products and a simple special safeguard mechanism which would guard against import surges and price falls in agriculture commodities. We have also stated categorically that developing countries like India, which allocates almost all its domestic subsidies to subsistence and resource poor farmers, should not be called upon to make any reduction in their *de minimis* entitlements.

As far as non-agricultural goods are concerned there is a broad consensus on the application of Swiss formula, only its structure and flexibilities for developing countries are yet to be finally negotiated. India has repeatedly stressed that as per the July framework agreement, developing countries would offer less than full reciprocity in reduction commitments and that any formula finally negotiated must respect this. Developed countries have yet to respond. While undertaking tariff cuts, we have also provided for adequate flexibilities to protect small scale

4.00 P.M.

industries, infant industries and sensitive sectors. The issue of binding all non-agricultural tariff lines is also under negotiation.

India has a strong comparative advantage in services. It is this strength and global competitiveness that has guided our stance in the GATS negotiations at the WTO. Our core objectives in this area are liberalisation of Mode 1 (Cross Border Supply) and Mode 4 (Movement of Natural persons) and disciplining of domestic regulations, which act as barries to effective market access for service providers from India.

In making our conditional offers we have not gone beyond the level of autonomous liberalisation in any sector, while expanding sectoral and modal coverage as compared to our Uruguay Round commitments. The efforts from the developed countries have so far been disappointing. However, the negotiations on this are expected to continue well into the year 2006 and final results would be available only at the end of 2006.

India has been at the forefront of recognition of the principles of "access to medicines for all at affordable prices" and was instrumental in getting all the WTO members to agree to introduce certain flexibilities agreed in the August 2003 decision are fully preserved in the eventual amendment to the TRIPS agreement so that the developed goals of countries which have inadequate or no manufacturing capacity are not undermined.

In the negotiations on trade and environment, we want to address the environmental concerns in a manner that we retain appropriate national policy space without undermining our common global responsibilities. We also want that the negotiations under trade and environment bring out the environmental benefits, the developmental benefits and the economic benefits in a "win-win-win" manner, rather than only an increase in market access.

In the negotiations on WTO rules such as on anti-dumping, subsidies and countervailing measures including fisheries subsidies, while India is not seeking to straicacket disciplines to an extent that WTO Members cannot check unfair trade practice, India seeks strengthenig of disciplines consistent with the Doha mandate in order to limit the unwarranted use of these measures, particularly against the exports from developing countries, including India.

On trade facilitation, the last 'Singapore issue' still remaining on the Doha agenda, the negotiations have been far less contentious. It potentially has a strong development dimension. So far, a large number of proposals have been made on issues concerning import and export procedures. India is actively participating in the negotiations and has submitted proposals for an effective cooperation mechanism between the customs administrations of the WTO Members. Technical assistance and capacity building in developing countries is another area where Ministers are focusing their energies.

On developmental issues, developing countries have put forth several constructive proposals. These include the implementation issues which are of considerable significance to us. We are seeking substantive progress on these issues both in the run up to and at Hong Kong. It is important that the WTO Members agree on an S&D package for the Least Developed Countries as well as ensure that effective special and differential treatment is provided for developing countries in all areas of the negotiations. India is also looking to provide additional market access to the products of the Least Developed Countries.

One other issue that has to be meaningfully addressed in this Round to make it a truly development Round is the concern regarding preference erosion. There are several developing countries that are dependant on a majority of their exports to the developed markets through systems of unilateral preferential tariffs. The reduction in tariffs following from this Round of negotiations will adversely impact the preference margins that these countries now enjoy thereby constricting their exports. This issue has to be handled carefully without in anyway slowing down the multilateral liberalisation process.

The draft ministerial text has been released in the WTO. It would be seen that there are wide divergence on a large number of issues, especially in agriculture and other goods. Our efforts would be to try and seek convergence on many of the outstanding issues. It is believed that full modalities in agriculture and other goods would not be possible in Hong Kong and that there may be a need for another ministerial meeting earlier next year to complete this stage of the negotiations. Hong Kong is,

therefore, a staging post to bringing about greater convergence so that full modalities could be achieved in 2006. India looks forward to the successful completion of the Doha Development Round by the end 2006.

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश): सभापति जी, मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूं कि आपने इस बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर, माननीय मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य पर, मुझे अपनी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त करने का अवसर दिया।

श्रीमन्, यह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण प्रकरण है, जो गरीब देशों के अरबों लोगों के जीवन से सीधा संबंधित है। पिछले कई चक्रों में इन प्रश्नों पर चर्चा होती रही है, दोहा में हुई, कानकुन में हुई, इसके बाद पिछले दिनों सिंगापुर में हुई और अब हांगकांग में मिनिस्टीरियल कांन्फरेंस होने जा रही है। यह सवाल इस बात पर निर्भर करता है कि इस कॉन्फरेंस में जो लोग भारत की तरफ से जाकर अपने विचार रखने जा रहे हैं, वे कितनी दृढ़ता एवं कितनी कुशलता के साथ इन प्रश्नों पर भारत के हितों को पेश कर सकेंगे। मुझे बड़े दु:ख के साथ कहना पड़ता है, मुझे याद है कि 1988-89 के समय जब उरुग्वे राउंड के बाद हमारे देश की सरकार मारकेश समझौते के लिए बात कर रही थी, हम लोगों ने इस बात का कितना विरोध किया था कि यह बहस पार्लियामेंट के माध्यम से होनी चाहिए, राज्य सरकारों के माध्यम से होनी चाहिए। बहुत से प्रतिनिधि मंडल वहां गए और सार्वजनिक रूप से बड़े-बड़े न्यायमूर्तियों ने रिपोर्ट पेश की। एक फोरम ऑफ पार्लियामेंटेरियन्स भी था, जिसका कि मैं संयोजक था। हमारे साथी श्री अशोक मित्र जी भी उसके सदस्य थे, उनके साथ ही साथ श्री चंन्द्रशेखर जी, श्री जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस जी और आज जो उस तरफ हैं, श्री जयपाल रेड्डी जी, वे भी उसके सदय थे, अन्य और भी कई लोग थे। उस समय हमने इस बात की चेतावनी दी थी कि ये हस्ताक्षर तब तक नहीं होने चाहिए, जब तक भारत की संसद एवं राज्य सरकारों से और साथ ही साथ सभी लोगों के हितों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाली सभी संबंधित संस्थाओं से इस पर गहरी चर्चा न हो जाए। जब उरुग्वे राउंड पर चर्चा हो रही थी, तब पहले तो भारत ने बड़ा दृढ़ रुख अख्तियार किया था। भारत, ब्राज़ील, अर्जेन्टायना और अन्य अनेक देश कुछ मामलों में बड़े संगठित हो कर काम कर रहे थे, लेकिन हम नहीं जानते कि ऐसा क्या हुआ कि भारत सरकार ने अपना रुख उस समय बदल लिया। तरह-तरह की बातें कही ता रही हैं, लेकिन इस बारे में मैं कुछ भी कहने में सक्षम नहीं हूं कि नेगोसिएशन्स में वहां पर क्या हुआ, लेकिन एक बात जरूर हुई कि लोगों ने यह कहा कि भारत ने बहुत से गरीब देशों के हितों के साथ अच्छा नहीं किया। कुछ लोगों ने तो उस समय हमें विश्वासघात करने वाला भी कहा था।

उसके बाद जब यह मारकेश का सवाल उठा, तब भी हमने यह देखा कि संसद से रेटीफाई करवाए बिना, संसद से मंजूरी लिए बिना ही सरकार ने उसे स्वीकार कर लिया था। यह एक विचित्र

परिस्थिति है। हमारे मित्र श्री चौहान साहब भी बैठे हैं, जो उन बहुत सी बातों को उसी तरह जानते हैं जैसे कि हम लोग जानते हैं। मैं नहीं जानता कि क्या अब भी हम उतना ही दृढ़ रुख रख सकेंगे, क्योंकि दृढ़ रुख हमें केवल दो बार ही देखने के लिए मिला, एक बार तब जब दोहा में श्री मारन साहब गए थे। स्वर्गीय श्री मारन साहब को मैंने इस बारे में हमेशा बधाई दी है और उनका अभिनन्दन किया है बौर पूरा देश करता है कि उन्होंने बहुत ही मज़बूती के साथ वहां पर भारत के हितों का संरक्षण किया था। उसके बाद हमारी इसी सभा के सदस्य श्री अरुण जेटली जी, जो उस समय वाणिज्य मंत्री थे, उन्होंने कानकुन में उसी बात को बहुत बल पूर्वक रखा और देश के हितों की काफी सुरक्षा की। आज ये जो गतिरोध पैदा हुआ है और अभी तक भी बहुत सी बातों में सुलझाव नहीं हो पा रहा है, उसका कारण यही है कि दोहा और कानकुन में प्रतिपक्ष की सरकारों ने जो आवाज उठाई थी, यह उसी का नतीजा था।

पहली बात तो मैं मंत्री जी से यह आश्वासन चाहूंगा, जैसा पहले भी सरकार यहां कहती रहती है कि हम बहुत मज़बूत रहेंगे, बहुत दृढ़ रहेंगे, लेकिन फिर पता नहीं लगता कि वहां क्या बात होती है, किधर से क्या परिस्थिति पैदा कर दी जाती है,कहीं से कोई दबाव आता है या कोई सुझाव आता है और सरकार अपना रुख़ बदल लेती है। तो पहली बात तो यह जरूरी है कि आपने बहुत सी अच्छी बातें इसमें कही हैं उस संबंध में मैं आपका स्वागत भी करुंगा उन बातों का, लेकिन आप उन पर मजबूती के साथ टिके रहें, ऐसा न हो कि 10-जनपथ से कोई आपके पास संदेश चला जाए और आप वहां दब जाएं...(व्यवधान)...

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया (राजस्थान): सर, यहां यह 10-जनपथ कहां से आता है।...(व्यवधान)... फिर हम बोलेंगे कि बाके घर से संदेश चला जाए।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: बैठिए, बैठिए।

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: फिर आपका नागपुर से कोई संदेश आ जाए...(व्यवधान)...

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: आ जाए तो हम उसको बहुत गहराई से देखेंगे हम दबते नहीं हैं। आपकी मुसीबत यह है कि संदेश आया और आप पलट गए। यह है बात। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री जी इस बारे में देश को भरोसे में लें, आश्वासन दें, वचन दें के वहां दबेंगे नहीं और जो भारत के हित हैं उनकी पूरे तौर पर वहां रक्षा करेंगे। यह बहुत बड़ी बात है क्योंकि अभी आपने बताया कि कृषि, यह एक बहुत अहम मुद्दा है जो सारी वार्तालाप वहां होगी। उसमें कृषि हमारी रोटी से संबंधित है, दुनियां के एक बिलियन गरीब आदमियों की रोटी से सीधी संबंधित है। और अगर आप रोटी को मार्केट फोर्सेस की दया पर छोड़ देंगे तो आप इससे बड़ा और कोई अपराध मानवता के साथ नहीं करेंगे। रोटी किसी भी हालत में बाजारी शक्तियों के दबाव पर नहीं छोड़ी जा सकती, उनकी दया पर नहीं छोड़ी जा सकती कि दुनियां के आदमी कितना खाएं, कब खाएं और कैसे खाएं इसका फैसला

कुछ ट्रांसनेशनल्स करें, कुछ मल्टीनेशनल्स करें, यह कभी नहीं होने दिया जा सकता और जब आप यह कहते हैं कि कृषि के हितों की आपको रक्षा करनी है, उसका अर्थ केवल किसान का ही सवाल नहीं है उसका अर्थ तमाम भूखे लोगों की समस्या से संबंधित है, जो आज दुनियां में रोटी के लिए तड़प रहे हैं। मुझे याद है कि 2003 में जो तत्कालीन वर्ल्ड बैंक के अध्यक्ष थे मि॰ वोलफिन्सन, उन्होंने यह स्वीकार किया कि यह दुनियां इम्बेलेंस्ड है "The world is out of balance"

बल्कि यह सही शब्द है और उसका एक मुख्य कारण उन्होंने यह कहा था कि यह अमीर देशों के लोग अपने किसानों को 400 बिलियन डॉलर की प्रति वर्ष की सब्सिडी देते हैं, जिससे भयानक असंतुलन पैदा हुआ है। उनका भाषण मेरे पास है। तो सवाल आज है कि उनको भी समझ में आ रहा है, इसका संबंध उन्होंने कहीं न कहीं आगे जोड़ा कि बीमारी से भी है, भुखमरी से भी है और टेरोरिज्म से भी है। यह एक सामान्य बात नहीं है कि अगर आप गरीब आदमी की रोटी के हितों की उपेक्षा करेंगे तो वह इस दुनियां में किस गहराई तक और कितनी दूर तक चीज़ों को ले जाएगी, यह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। इसलिए भगवान के नाम पर, दुनियां के भुखमरों के नाम पर, हिन्दुस्तान के गरीबों के नाम पर, हिन्दुस्तान की 70 प्रतिशत आबादी के नाम पर आप उनके हितों के संरक्षण के लिए पूरी दृढ़ता दिखाएं, क्योंकि पिछले जुलाई पैकेज में, मुझे आप क्षमा करेंगे कि आप उतनी दृढ़ता नहीं दिखा सके, जितनी कि दिखानी चाहिए थी और इसका नतीजा हमारे सामने है।

श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया: 2001 में क्या किया?

श्री सभापति: बोलने दीजिए उनको, आप बाद में बोल लेना।

डॉ॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: वह तो आपके हाथ में था, आपने जो हस्ताक्षर किए थे और उसी को हम करते चले आ रहे हैं। जब 1993-94 में जिस समय ये वार्ताएं समाप्त हुईं तो जो सदस्य देश थे उनको कहा गया कि वे अपना टैरिफ का शैड्यूल प्रस्तुत करेंगे और उनके इम्पोर्ट पर क्या कमिटमैंट होंगे। उस समय हमारे देश के इम्पोर्ट पर जो टैरिफ थे, वे 110 परसैंट थे बिना स्टेफ होल्डर्स की कंसल्टेशन के, बिना देश के तमाम लोगों से बहस किए हुए, तब आपकी सरकार थी, इस टैरिफ को 40 प्रतिशत में घटा दिया और अब जो हमारा औसत टैरिफ है इण्डस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्ट पर वह 15 परसैंट के करीब है और इसको और भी घटाने का दबाब हमारे ऊपर लाया जा रहा है कि इसको आप जीरो परसैंट तक ले जाएं, इसको बिल्कुल समाप्त कर दें। इसके भारी दुष्परिणाम होंगे, अगर आप टैरिफ इस तरह से अविवेकपूर्ण ढंग से नीचे घटाते चले जाएंगे। यह देश की अर्थव्यवस्था को काफी छिन्न-भिन्न करेगा, इंवेस्टमैंट हमारे देश के अंदर कम करेगा, हमारी अपनी मेन्युफैक्चरिंग केपेसिटी को नष्ट करेगा और विदेशी इम्पोर्टेड सामान को ही यहां वरीयता मिलेगी। यह आप देख लें इसके बारे में मैं आपको आंकड़े भी दूंगा कि दुनिया के देशों में अब क्या

हो रहा है। यह तो इसमें कोई सवाल ही नहीं है कि यह जो अभी कृषि पर एग्रीमेंट है, कृषि पर आज समझौता है, जिस पर बातचीत हो रही है, वह तो पूरे तौर पर धनी देशों के हितों की तरफ ही रक्षा करता है, उसमें विकासशील या गरीब देशों में या जो निर्धन देश हैं, उनकी तो बिल्कुल चिंता है ही नहीं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप यह देखें कि जिस कृषि पर समझौते के पहले दस सालों में, जब से यह हुआ, तब से यह आज तक क्या हुआ है, उसका क्या परिणाम हुआ है? उस परिणाम के आधार पर, आप फिर इस समझौते की गहराई को देखें। पहली बात तो यह देखें कि जो निचली आय के देश हैं, वहां 70 परसेंट रोजगार कृषि में है और मध्यम आय के देशों में 30 परसेंट रोजगार कृषि में है और जो अमीर देश हैं, उनके यहां केवल 4 प्रतिशत रोजगार कृषि में है। आज इस तरह से करीब-करीब 3.1 बिलियन लोग इस कृषि पर निर्भर हैं। अब जरा देखें कि प्रथम 10 वर्षों में क्या हुआ है? मेरे पास एक रिपोर्ट है, उसमें कुछ आंकड़े दिये हैं और कुछ देशों का हाल दिया है। इसमें एक इंडोनेशिया का जिक्र किया गया है। यह रिपोर्ट है, The Trade Liberalisation and Agriculture and Lessons from the first 10 years of the WTO by Dr. Devedra Sharma. इसमें वह कहते हैं कि 1984 से 1988 तक इंडोनेशिया न केवल आत्मनिर्भर था बल्कि वह एक्सपोर्टर था। उसके पास अधिशेष था और सरकार की जो सपोर्ट करने की नीति थी, उससे उनके यहां पैडी का उत्पादन बहुत बढ़ा। वर्ष 1984 से 1988 तक 3.5 परसेंट की दर से उस समय बढ़ रहा था। लेकिन जैसे ही वर्ष 1997 में यह एशियन फाइनेंसेस क्राइसेस हुए और ट्रेड लिबरलाइजेशन के तमाम नियम, जो कि वर्ल्ड बैंक ने और आईएमएफ ने उनके ऊपर थोप दिये, तो नतीजा क्या हुआ? वह यह कहते हैं कि "Indonesia turned into a net importer of rice".

श्री कमल नाथ : वह तो एशियन क्राइसिस में।

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: उसके बाद ही, in 1999 the rice crop was hit by certain pests and all that. लेकिन उनके ऊपर जो लिबरलाइजेशन के प्रतिबंध लगाये गये और उनके यहां इम्पोर्ट होने लगा, उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि...(**व्यवधान**)... आपने जब लिबरलाइजेशन किया, जब ये नीतियां तय कीं, तो उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह एक्सपोर्टर से इम्पोर्टर हो गया। अब क्या आप उसको इम्पोर्टर से फरदर इम्पोर्टर बनाना चाहते हैं। ... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्री कमल नाथ : इंडोनेशिया की बात है।

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: हां, यह इंडोनेशिया की बात है। मैं इंडोनेशिया की ही बात कर रहा हूं। उन तमाम देशों की बात कर रहा हूं जिन्होंने मार्केट ऐक्सेस अपने यहां अलाऊ किया और उनकी हालत क्या है। फिर आप फिलीपींस को देखें। "Philippines was a net food exporter between 1970 and 1990". लेकिन जब से उन्होंने ये नीतियां अपनाई हैं, "It took a U-turn to become a food importer by 2000". अब वर्ष 2000 में वह फिर फूड इम्पोर्टर हो

गया। अब आप उसे कहां तक ले जाना चाहेंगे! मैं उन देशों का जिक्र आपसे कर रहा हूं जिन्होंने अविवेकपूर्ण ढंग से, बिना कुछ सोचे समझे, दबाव में आकर के कुछ नीतियों का अविलम्बन किया और वे एक्सपोर्टर से इम्पोर्टर बन गये। आप थाईलैंड को थोड़ा छोड़ दें और बाकी उस तमाम खित्ते के जितने देश हैं, उनसे हमें सीखना चाहिए कि किस तरह से फूड सेक्योरिटी उन देशों की नष्ट हो रही है। मैं आपको यह भी बताना चाहूंगा कि जब से इस प्रकार के एग्रीमेंट की चर्चा होनी शुरू हुई है, लिबरलाइजेशन शुरू हुआ है और फूड इम्पोर्ट देशों ने शुरू किया और आपने मार्केट ऐक्सेस दी, तो आज स्थिति यह हो गई है कि सबसे ज्यादा फूड पर जो कंट्रोल है, वह 12 या 13 ट्रांस नेशनल कम्पनीज का है। यह एक खतरनाक चीज होती है, यह फूड सेक्योरिटी पर आघात करती है। आपकी कोई सेक्योरिटी, जब तक फूड सेक्योरिटी नहीं हो, वह बच नहीं सकतीं। इस तरफ देखने की जरूरत है कि क्या फूड का इम्पोर्ट होने देना, हमारे हित में होगा, हमारे देश के हित में होगा या इन गरीब देशों के हित में होगा। यह बुनियादी सवाल है और जिस ढंग से धनी देश कृषि के क्षेत्र में काम कर रहे हैं, वह कितना भयावह है, वह कितना खतरनाक है। वह तो 400 बिलियन डालर जो वर्ल्ड बैंक के अध्यक्ष ने बताया है, उसके जो आंकड़े आते हैं, उनसे पता चलता है कि क्या हो रहा है? यह बड़ी विचित्र बात है। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं। इसी रिपोर्ट में आगे कहते हैं, "As a result , before we try to understand the implications of these reforms on developing countries' agriculture, it is important to see what it means to small farmers even in Europe. In 1999, 56 per cent of the all-EU agricultural expenditure was in the form of direct payment to the farmers". फिर आगे चलकर कहते हैं, "Nearly 80 per cent of the subsidies are paid to only 20 per cent of farmers". फिर कहते हैं, "As a result, small farmers are becoming uncompetitive and, therefore, opting out of agriculture. In the UK, for instance, 17,000 farmers and farm workers left the laid in 2003, and currently, across the EU, one farm is lost every minute. हर एक मिनट में एक खेतिहर से बेरोजगार बनता जा रहा है, अपनी जमीन बेच रहा है। The richest man in the United Kingdom, the Duke of Westminster, who owns about 55,ooo hectares of farm estates receives an average subsidy of Pounds 300,000 as direct payment." and in addition gets pound 350,000 a year for the 1200 dairy cows he owns.

ऐसे ही तमाम देशों के अंदर, जो वहां की फार्म सब्सिडी इन देशों में जा रही है, डेनमार्क में, ब्रिटेन में, वह सब किन लोगों को जा रही है? वे कुछ चुने हुए ऊपर के लोग हैं जिनके पास दस हजार हेक्टेयर, बीस हजार हेक्टेयर, पचास हजार हेक्टेयर है, वे उससे लाभान्वित हो रहे हैं और कितनी बड़ी मात्रा में लाभान्वित हो रहे हैं, किसकी कॉस्ट पर लाभान्वित हो रहे हैं इसको समझ लें कि one farm every minute is being lost to them. 2000 और 2003 के बीच में इनकी सब्सिडी की वजह से अमेरिका हमारे बाजारों को भी distort कर रहा है और क्या हश्र हो रहा है, उसको भी देख

लें। यह कहता है कि Between 2000-03, the paddy used to cost, on an average, $415 to grow and mill one tonne of white rice in the U.S.; however, that rice was exported around the world for just $274 per tonne, dumped on developing country markets at a price of 34 per cent below its cost. यह उनकी सब्सिडी और एक्सपोर्ट सब्सिडीज, इन सबका नतीजा है। आज वे करने क्या जा रहे हैं? अभी इस चर्चा में, मैंने उसका ड्राफ्ट भी देखा है, कहीं यह समझ में नहीं आता कि वे अपनी सब्सिडीज को कैसे घटाएंगे या क्या करेंगे। जहां तक मुझे याद है, यह इनका कमिटमेंट था, इस एग्रीमेंट के अंदर कि they were required to reduce some of their domestic subsidies under the amber box by 20 per cent. The export subsidies were to be reduced by 36 per cent. लेकिन हुआ क्या है? In 1986, the USA was providing $75 billions to its subsidies. उनको कम करना था, 60 बिलियन डालर पर लाना था, बढ़ाकर 94 बिलियन डालर कर दिया। अब आप कहां से उसे घटाएंगे? 94 बिलियन डालर से घटाएंगे या जो उनको शुरू में 75 बिलियन डालर दे रहे थे, वहां से घटाएंगे? बेस ईयर क्या है? इसका कहीं जिक्र नहीं है। आपका भी भाषण मैंने सुना है। आप कहते हैं कि from a date subsequently. किसी एक तारीख से उसकी डेट नेगोशिएट होनी है, यह आप कहते हैं। डेट नेगोशिएट कब से होगी? बुनियादी बात तो यह है कि वे कब से अपनी ऐक्सपोर्ट सब्सिडी और डोमैस्टिक सब्सिडी घटाएंगे? उसकी कोई चर्चा आपके डाक्यूमेंट में नहीं है। मैंने डब्ल्यूटीओ का डाक्यूमेंट भी देखा है, उसमें इस बारे में कोई चर्चा नहीं है कि वे अपनी सब्सिडी कब से घटाएंगे। क्या हम इस बात के ऊपर डटेंगे, लड़ेंगे कि इसका बेस ईयर तय होना चाहिए और किस तरह से वह घटनी चाहिए? कैसे घटाएं वे, क्योंकि उन्होंने मना कर दिया है। अभी मैंने देखी है उनकी, ईयू की कॉमन एग्रीकल्चर पॉलिसी, यह रिपोर्ट कहती है, जो बड़ी खतरनाक बात है। The EU Common Agricultural Policy, CAP, reforms initiated in 2003 with implementation beginning in 2005 have, for instance, ensured that the overall level of subsidisation of the US's farm products will not change. The amount of subsidy that a farmer received in the reference period 2000-02 becomes his personal entitlement for the next ten years till 2013. 2013 तक वे अपनी सब्सिडी नहीं घटाएंगे। 2010 या 2011 तक अमेरिकन सब्सिडी नहीं घटाएंगे तो बात किस पर हुई? जब उन्होंने पहले ही यह तय कर लिया है कि अभी तो हमने कुछ नहीं करना है और फिर उसके बाद वे बेस ईयर तय करेंगे। क्या बात हो रही है? क्या बताया जा रहा है? ऐग्रीकल्चर के ऐग्रीमेंट पर, मैं नहीं समझता कि हम अभी तक किसी जगह पर पहुंचे हैं। फिर नॉन टेरिफ मेजर्स के बारे में भी जैसे मैंने बताया कि 36 परसेंट उनको घटाने थे, वह उन्होंने नहीं किए बल्कि स्पैशल सेफगार्ड मेजर्स और पीस क्लॉज के दौरान तो आप कोई डिस्प्यूट उठा ही नहीं सकते इसलिए 2005 तक तो आप कोई डिस्प्यूट उठा ही नहीं सकते। अब आगे

आप डिस्प्यूट उठाएंगे इसलिए यह सब तो खत्म हुआ। इससे पहले जो कुछ हो रहा था, वह तो टेकन फॉर ग्रांटिड हो गया। उसके बारे में कोई डिस्प्यूट नहीं है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि ये सब सवाल आप करेंगे कि नहीं करेंगे और वहां इन बातों पर खुलकर और जमकर चर्चा होगी कि या नहीं होगी? क्योंकि इसके परिणाम बहुत गहरे हैं, इसलिए मैं आपसे यह कह सकता हूं कि अगर आपने इस पर ज्यादा जोर नहीं दिया और इसके ऊपर जमकर वहां बात नहीं की तो निश्चित रूप से मुझे खतरा लगता है कि हमारे देश की कृषि पर ही नहीं, हमारी पूरी फूड सिक्योरिटी पर भारी संकट आएगा। इसके साथ-साथ अभी आपने ट्रिप्स का जिक्र किया। जो सीड्स के सवाल हैं, जो बीज के सवाल हैं, वे और बहुत गहरे सवाल हैं, इसके साथ-साथ वे भी हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था को ध्वस्त करने वाले सवाल हैं। जब आप ट्रिप्स पर वहां चर्चा करेंगे, मुझे पता नहीं कि इस बार कुछ हो पाएगी या नहीं हो पाएगी, लेकिन जब भी आप चर्चा करें तो इस बात को ध्यान में रखें कि अगर बीज पर एकाधिकार इन सब लोगों का हो गया तो वह और खतरनाक बात होगी। हिंदुस्तान में हजारों करोड़ रुपए का, शायद चालीस से पचास हजार करोड़ रुपए का बीज का बाजार है, वह अगर उनके हाथ में जाता है, तो और खतरे की बात पैदा होती है।

ट्रिप्स के बारे में आपने बड़ी अच्छी बात कही, उससे मैं सहमत हूं कि ट्रिप्स के बारे में पुनर्विचार होना चाहिए। बात बिल्कुल वजनदार है, लेकिन यहां भी आपने कुछ ट्रिप्स के बारे में चर्चा की है और मशेलकर साहब को एक कमेटी बनाकर रिपोर्ट देने की बात कही है। मैं यह चाहूंगा कि वह रिपोर्ट स्टैंडिंग कमेटी के पास भी भेजी जाए, ताकि उस पर भी एक बार वहां चर्चा हो जाए, तब आप उसे सदन में लाएं। जल्दबाजी में करना ठीक नहीं है।

आपने दवाइयों के बारे में बड़ी चिंता की है। मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि आप यह चिंता व्यक्त कर रहे हैं, लेकिन यह चिंता आप उस समय भूल गए थे, जब पेटेंट कानून पास हो रहा था, उस समय हमारे ये मित्र भी थोड़ी देर के लिए यह भूल गए थे। उसका क्या परिणाम हुआ है, वह बाज़ार में साफ दिखाई दे रहा है। दवाइयों के दाम किस कदर बढ़ रहे हैं, उसको आप महसूस करेंगे। हमें और आपको तो सरकारी दवाइयां मिल जाती हैं, इसलिए शायद हमें उतनी चिंता नहीं होती, हमें उतनी पीड़ा नहीं होती, लेकिन आम आदमी के लिए आज बहुत सी दवाइयां प्राप्त करना कष्टसाध्य हो गया है, उसकी जेब से बाहर है। तो वहां पूरे ट्रिप्स के बारे में पुनर्विचार होना चाहिए और न केवल इस पर विचार होना चाहिए बल्कि मैं आपको कहना चाहूंगा कि फूड सिक्योरिटी के बारे में ट्रिप्स के साथ और दवाइयों के साथ, दोनों के बारे में गंभीर चर्चा वहां होनी चाहिए, अगर वह चर्चा वहां हो पाए तो। मेरा यह कहना है कि आई.पी.आर. ऐसे नहीं होने चाहिए जो शोषणकारी हों, जो गरीब देशों के ऊपर बोझ डालते हों, वह चाहे दवाई का सवाल हो, वह चाहे टेक्नालॉजी का सवाल हो, वह

चाहे बीज का सवाल हो, क्योंकि टेक्नालॉजी दुनिया के विकास की कुंजी है और उसके ऊपर जो मोनोपोली है, वह अपने आप में खतरनाक चीज़ है। बहरहाल, जितना वह पास कर चुके हैं, वह कर चुके हैं लेकिन ट्रिप्स का re-negotiation बहुत से मामलों में होना जरूरी है, क्योंकि इन आठ-दस सालों में लोगों ने देख लिया है कि ट्रिप्स की उन व्यवस्थाओं ने किस तरह हमारे आर्थिक विकास को मंद किया है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि खास तौर पर जो आई.पी.आर. रिजीम बायो-रिसोर्सेज के साथ संबंधित है, वह ऐसी हो कि हमारे फूड सिक्योरिटी पर किसी भी तरह से प्रभाव न डाले, क्योंकि बायोडाइवर्सिटी के अंदर जिस प्रकार से genetic manipulation आज होते हैं, और तरह-तरह की चीज़ें लाई जाती हैं—कुछ चीज़ें विकास के लिए ज़रूरी हैं, वे हम भी लाए हैं, लाएंगे भी और ला भी रहे हैं, लेकिन कुछ ऐसी चीज़ें भी होती हैं जो हमारी फूड सिक्योरिटी को प्रभावित करती हैं, उनसे बचने के लिए ट्रिप्स के बारे में जब भी चर्चा हो, तो उसका पूरा ध्यान रखना चाहिए, यह मैं ज़रूर आपसे कहना चाहूंगा।

आपने इसमें यह कहा है कि नॉन-एग्रीकल्चरल मार्केट के बारे में जो आप submit करने जा रहे हैं, उसमें आपने एक स्विस फॉर्मूले की चर्चा की है। यह स्विस फॉर्मूला सारी दुनिया के लिए एक-सा हो, इस पर भी गहराई से विचार करना चाहिए कि यह होना चाहिए या नहीं होना चाहिए, क्योंकि ये जो धनी देश हैं, ये धनी देश जिस तरह से टैरिफ्स को manipulate करते हैं, उनको एक विशेष परिस्थिति में पीक वैल्यूज़ और लोअर वैल्यूज़ कब-कहां-वह हमारे लिए काफी तकलीफ़देह चीज़ हो जाती है और वे selective market access देते हैं। थोड़ी देर के लिए देंगे, थोड़ी सी चीज़ के लिए खोलेंगे और हमसे चाहेंगे कि हम पूरा बाज़ार खोल दें, हर चीज़ में खोल दें, लेकिन हमें ध्यान रखना होगा कि इस मामले में हम बहुत सावधानी रखें और जैसा मैंने पहले भी अनुरोध किया था कि पूरे तौर पर टैरिफ्स को समाप्त करना, यह हमारे लिए ठीक नहीं होगा। उससे हमारे देश में विकास और हमारे प्राकृतिक साधनों पर नियंत्रण रखने की जो सरकार को सुविधा होनी चाहिए, जो अधिकार होना चाहिए, वह इसमें नहीं रहेगा। तो इस पर बहुत गहराई से विचार करने की जरूरत है और यह जो बात की जा रही है, इस पर जो दोहरा मैनडेट था पहले, कि टैरिफ पीक्स, टैरिफ एस्केलेशन और हाई टैरिफ्स—जो धनी देशों में हैं, उनको जो एक्सपोर्ट के इंटरेस्ट के प्रोडक्ट्स हैं डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज के लिए, उसको हटना चाहिए, लेकिन उस मैन्डेट को हटा दिया गया है। उस पर तो वे एक्सपोर्ट टैरिफ लगा देते हैं, ताकि हमारे लिए वे महंगे होते चले जाएं, तो इस बात पर भी बल देना चाहिए कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए।

फिर हमारी कुछ sensitive tariff lines को टैरिफ रिडक्शन से बचाने की भी बात है, उस पर भी ध्यान देना चाहिए और हमें ये आइडेंटिफाई करने पड़ेंगे कि ऐसी कौन सी चीज़ें हैं—जैसे ऑटोमोबाइल्स पार्ट्स में आजकल हम काफी तेज़ी से आगे बढ़ रहे हैं, तो उस बारे में हमें गहराई से ध्यान देना होगा कि... इनका विदेशी बाजार घटने न पाए, क्योंकि जब से मैं ग्लोबलाइजेशन

और लिबरलाइजेशन की प्रक्रिया का अध्ययन कर रहा हूं तो उसमें हमेशा यह लगता है, जब कभी किसी धनी देश के, किसी बाजार के ऊपर, किसी गरीब देश का थोड़ा-थोड़ा प्रभाव पड़ने लगता है तो खट से उसको रोक देते हैं।...(व्यवधान)... तो यह एक सवाल है। मैं तो आपको भी समझा रहा हूं, उनको भी समझा रहा हूं और सारे देश को समझा रहा हूं। अगर समझ जाएं तो अच्छी बात है। ...(व्यवधान)... हम तो चाहते हैं कि आप ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): इनको भी समझाया, उनको भी समझाया। पंडित जी समझ पाए हैं, बाकी लोग नहीं समझ पाए हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी: श्रीमन्, अच्छी बात है। जो हो गया सो हो गया, आगे तो समझो। ...(व्यवधान)... मैं तो उस समय से कह रहा था दीपांकर बाबू, जब आप इन समस्याओं में ज्यादा रुचि नहीं लेते थे। ...(व्यवधान)... मैं आज फिर कह रहा हूं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: बोलने दीजिए, बोलने दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: हमारे अध्यापक हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: अध्यापक हैं तो क्लास में जाइए, यहां क्या कर रहे हो?

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मैं पार्टी आधार पर बहुत सी बातें नहीं उठा रहा हूं। मैं तो यह कह रहा हूं कि इस समय देश हित में, हम जहां जा रहे हैं, उसमें कोई पार्टी की हैसियत से नहीं जा रहे हैं, ये जा रहे हैं तो देश के प्रतिनिधि के तौर पर जा रहे हैं। मैं इनसे इसलिए नहीं कह रहा हूं कि जब ये वहां जाएंगे, तब हमारा कोई मत इनसे अलग होगा। लेकिन वहां जाने से पहले, जो हमारे सरोकार हैं, वे हम इनके सामने रख रहे हैं। उन सरोकारों पर ध्यान देकर आप वहां बात करें और जो कुछ वहां फैसले हों, वे बिना पार्लियामेंट की अनुमति के रेटिफाई न हों। यहां आएं तो उन पर फिर से बहस हो, तब उस पर कुछ करें। अमेरिका क्या करता है, वह अपने पैरामीटर्स डिफाइन कर देता है, हम क्यों नहीं करते? अमेरिका अपना कानून बना लेता है और सारे पैरामीटर्स डिफाइन कर देता है। हमारी संसद से ये अधिकार क्यों छीने हुए हैं? आइए, एक बार इन पर बहस हो जाए, बात हो जाए कि इन मामलों पर बात करने के लिए हमारे पैरामीटर्स क्या होंगे? फिर उन पैरामीटर्स के अंदर आप बात करें, तो सारा देश उसी के आधार पर चलेगा। अमेरिका तो हर मामले में कहता है कि मेरा लॉ यह है, मेरा कानून यह कहता है। हमारे क्या कानून हैं? हम कई बार ऐसा करते हैं कि अच्छा चलो अमेरिका का कानून है, उसी के साथ हो लो, तो यह ठीक नहीं है। हमें अपना पैरामीटर, अपने देश के हित में, अपनी संसद के द्वारा बनवाना चाहिए। मेरा इस मामले में बहुत आग्रह है कि यह बात यहां होनी चाहिए। संसद को यह अधिकार होना चाहिए। यह बहुत जरूरी है। इसमें किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। मैं जो आज आप से यह कह रहा हूं कि यह सवाल देश के हित में है। मैं आप से

बिल्कुल स्पष्ट यह कह रहा हूं कि किसी भी कीमत पर जो हमारे इंडस्ट्रियल टेरिफ्स हैं, उनको और घटाने की जरूरत नहीं है। जो हमारे बाउंडेड टेरिफ्स हैं, वहां तक तो हम जा सकते हैं, जिनमें हम जा सकते हैं तो उनमें हम जाएं और घबराएं नहीं। यदि हमें अपनी अर्थव्यवस्था को ठीक करना है, अपने मजदूरों को, अपने किसानों को काम देना है, अपने लोगों को रोटी देनी है, रोजगार देना है तो इसमें हमें उस हिसाब से व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। केवल इसलिए कि उसका फायदा किसी दूसरे मित्र देश को हो रहा है, यही अकेला आधार नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं अंत में, ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: आपका टाइम हो गया है। ...(व्यवधान)... आप बीच में क्यों बोल रहे हैं? ...(व्यवधान)... आपका टाइम हो गया, तब भी नहीं मानते। ...(व्यवधान)...

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी: सर, मैं समझ गया माननीय सदस्य को तकलीफ हो रही है। ... (व्यवधान)... जहां तक सर्विसेज का सवाल है, हमारे लिए सर्विसेज बहुत महत्वपूर्ण हैं। सेवा के क्षेत्र को आपने स्वयं स्वीकार किया है कि हमारी GDP की 52 प्रतिशत आय उसी से होती है। सर्विसेज के मामले में हमें बहुत दृढ़ रहना चाहिए। हमें कोई ऐसा समझौता नहीं होने देना चाहिए कि जिससे हमारे लोगों के जाने में किसी प्रकार का भी कोई अवरोध पैदा हो। लेकिन आप देख रहे हैं कि अमेरिका ने कानून पास कर दिया है कि उनके हर राज्य से पहले लाइसेंस लेना पड़ेगा। यदि वह अपने राज्य की बात कर सकता है तो हम अपने राज्यों की बात क्यों नहीं कर सकते? वह कहता है कि हमने निश्चित कर दिया है कि इतने ही लोग जाएंगे। ऐसा क्यों है? आप लिबरलाइज्ड माहौल में रहते हैं। आप कहते हैं कि 'वर्ल्ड इज ए फैमिली', आप कहते हैं कि 'वर्ल्ड इज ए विलेज' लेकिन विलेज में तो एक मोहल्ले से दूसरे मोहल्ले में जाने के लिए कोई परमिट नहीं होता है। इनके यहां, जहां पर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का राज है, वहां भी ऐसा नहीं होता है। वहां भी फ्री मूवमेंट है। कोलकाता से कोई भी दिनाजपुर जा सकता है, हावड़ा जा सकता है, तो इस डेमोक्रेटिक कंट्री में, ऐसा क्यों किया जा रहा है? वे एक तरफ डेमोक्रेसी की बात करते हैं, लिबरलाइजेशन की बात करते हैं, फ्रीडम ऑफ मूवमेंट की बात करते हैं। उसका व्यापार यहां आ जाए। उनका सामान यहां आ जाए, लेकिन हमारा आदमी वहां क्यों नहीं जाए? वहां वन वे ट्रैफिक क्यों हो? यह आग्रह के साथ होना चाहिए कि सर्विसेज में कोई ऐसा समझौता नहीं होगा। इस पर इस तरह की कोई बंदिशें नहीं होंगी, जो हमारे देश के लोगों के वहां जाने पर बाधा डाले, प्रतिबंधित करे। मैंने जहां तक देखा था, इन सर्विसेज के क्षेत्र में जो प्रपोजल्स आने वाले थे, वें पहले 2003 या 2004 तक आने वाले थे, वे 2005 तक बढ़ा दिए गए, अब वे 2005 तक आएंगे। प्रपोजल्स की लिस्ट मैं नहीं जानता कि कितनी है, लेकिन जो हमारे सामने देखने में आए तो वह यह थे कि 92 देशों ने अभी तक केवल 69 प्रपोजल्स दिए हैं। शायद इसे और बढ़ाया जाए। ये प्रपोजल्स क्यों नहीं आ रहे हैं? भारत ने जो प्रपोजल्स दिए हैं, वे बहुत मीनिंगफुल हैं। डब्ल्यु.टी.ओ. के लोग खुद कहते हैं, उनका अध्यक्ष खुद कहता है कि बहुत से प्रपोजल्स कुछ मायने नहीं रखते हैं, ये बिल्कुल निरर्थक हैं, इनसे कोई बात

नहीं बनती है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं, मंत्री महोदय, मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इन सारे सवालों पर आप संसद के पैरामीटर्स क्यों नहीं बनाते हैं? संसद के पैरामीटर्स बन जाएं, उनके आधार पर आप वहां जाएं, बेधड़क होकर जाएं। मुझे एक बार एक अमेरिकन अम्बेसडर ने कहा था, मैंने उनसे कहा था कि आप सुपर-301 अपनी स्टेच्युट बुक से हटा दीजिए, तो उन्होंने कहा कि, डा. जोशी, यह हमारी सोवरेनिटी का सवाल है। It represents the sovereignty of America. आज बता रहा हूं कि मैंने उन्हें जवाब दिया था कि आप सोवरेनिटी 23 करोड़ आदमियों की है, मेरी सोवरेनिटी 98 करोड़ आदमियों की है। उस समय हमारे देश की जनसंख्या इतनी थी। आप क्यों डरते हैं? आप क्यों इन मामलों में झिझकते हैं? आप डंके की चोट पर कहिए। जितनी जरूरत उन्हें हमारी है, हमें उससे ज्यादा जरूरत उनकी नहीं है। उनके हित ही सर्वोपरि हैं, हमारे हित नहीं हैं, मैं इस बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूं। आप इस देश के प्रतिनिधि बनकर वहां जा रहे हैं। आप सौ करोड़ से ज्यादा लोगों के प्रतिनिधि हैं, इनकी ताकत आपके साथ है, आप उस ताकत के साथ जाइए और तब नेगोशिएट कीजिए, जैसा कि मारन साहब ने अरुण जेटली ने किया था। 98 करोड़ लोगों की ताकत के साथ इन्होंने नेगोशिएट किया था। मुझे खतरा और कोई नहीं है। आपकी बात यहां देखता हूं तो इसमें बहुत सी बातें बहुत अच्छी हैं। लेकिन मुझे यह डर लगता है कि वहां जाकर आप इन्हें भूल जाएंगे। उस डर से मैं बचना चाहता हूं और इस समय आपका कैटेगोरिकल एश्योरेंस चाहता हूं कि वहां आप नहीं डरेंगे। यहां जितनी बेबाकी से, फर्राटे से आपने पढ़ा, मुझे बड़ा अच्छा लगा कि आप बड़ी हिम्मत के साथ पढ़ रहे थे, लेकिन वही हिम्मत आप वहां हांगकांग में दिखाएं, यह बहुत जरूरी है। यह मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है। अंत में मैं आपसे ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। बस हो गया।

डा. मुरली मनोहर जोशी: अंत में मैं आपसे यह कहूंगा, मैं कन्क्लूड कर रहा हूं कि पिछले दस-पंद्रह सालों में जो एग्रीमेंट ऑन एग्रीकल्चर हुआ था, वह इम्प्लिमेंट नहीं हो सका है। आप आज यह कोशिश कीजिए कि एग्रीकल्चर डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. के दायरे से बाहर आ जाएं अगर यह बाहर आती है तो उसी में हमारा हित है। इसके लिए आप तैयारियां कीजिए। आपने जी-20 बनाया, जी-33 बनाया, बीच में आपने 25 भी बना लिया, जिससे लोगों के मन में थोड़ी-सी सुगबुगाहट होने लगी कि बीच में यह क्या आ गया। ऐसा कुछ मत कीजिए और डंके की चोट पर कहिए। एग्रीकल्चर हमारे लिए रोटी का सवाल है। यह रोटी, लोगों की भूख और लोगों की बीमारी पर सिर्फ डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. और मल्टी नेशनल्स को हुकूमत करने की इजाजत नहीं दी जा सकती। यह मानवता के खिलाफ सबसे बड़ा अपराध होगा। आप उस मानवता के प्रतिनिधि बनकर जाइए। हम सब आपके साथ रहेंगे, जिस दिन आप हिन्दुस्तान की नहीं, दुनिया के भूखों और बीमारों की दवाइयों को इस डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. की जिद से बाहर करेंगे, सारा देश नहीं, पूरी दुनिया आपका गुणगान करेगी। मैं यह कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। श्री नीलोत्पल बसु।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir. I think, this is for the first time that we are having a discussion, in the House, on the Ministerial Meeting in the run up to the conclusion of the GATT Round. Earlier, on both the occasions, we had discussions *post facto*, after the discussions had been held. And, I must thank the Government to have, ultimately, agreed to our proposal to have a discussion. But, at the same time, I have certain observations. And, let me start with the note of hope, with which the hon. Minister concludes his statement. Para 19 of the statement says, "The draft ministerial text has been released in the WTO. It would be seen that there are wide divergences on a large of issues, especially, in agriculture and other goods. Our efforts would be to try and seek convergence on many of the outstanding issues. It is believed that full modalities in agriculture and other goods would not be possible in Hong Kong and that there may be a need for another ministerial meeting earlier next year to complete this stage of the negotiations." Now, my discomfort starts from this hope because though the draft text has been released just now, the response that we had from developing countries all over the world to the draft text really belie the kind of hope that has been expressed in that. If it is for gallery play to the international community, which is an euphemism for some of the developed regions, I have no problem. But sincerely, if we hope that the manner in which the entire draft has been structured, really there will be convergence, I have and we have, as a Party, our problems with that because, you see, the imbalance runs throughout the draft. First of all, what is the negotiating strategy of the developed countries? That is, to push the issues which are of concern to the devloped world to the background, the manner in which the Chairman's text has been used as a ploy to push in controversial text which does not reflect a consensus; yet, an impression has been created that there is a consensus. Divergences have not been noted, the areas of divergence have not been put in the Annexure; all these things are there. Some of us who have gone through the draft have seen this. And the way the sections on agriculture, non-agricultural market access and services, which are also, incidentally, the main concern of the developed countires have been pushed is some thing which we also need to go into very specifically. I was hearing very aptly and attentively to Dr. Joshi. Unfortunately, he has left. I think, since he has put it on record, I have to also put it on record. He

was referring to what happened during the third amendment to the Patent Act and the position that we have taken. Now, his misfortune is, he is in a company which has not bought his ideas. And, he posed this question at that time also. I said, Sir, we cannot but disagree with you but the point is, you were a member of the Cabinet which rejected some of the amendments, which were pushed by the Left Parties when you were pushing the second amendment. Even in the Select Committee it went as 'notes of dissent.' And, ultimately, it is this Government — we have our differences, we have our disagreements but, at the same time—which have pushed some of these as official amendments which could not also find a place in your Select Committee Report at that point of time, but have now become official amendments. And, these are facts, but still there are areas of disagreement and we will, certainly, go on articulating them. I can only sympathise with Dr. Joshi. I quite appreciate his 'never-say-die' spirit on this. But, I think, that kind of a position does not really increase the credibility of the Benches which he occupies.

Now, I come to the statement of the Minister again. He has started with the negotiating strategy. We feel that this whole approach of issue-based coalitions could have been avoided. Of course, we can coordinate, but if we give an impression that we are not representing the whole of the developing countries, we will, basically, weaken our negotiating position, and, particulary, the Government's explanation on the question of being part of the FIPS process where we were with America. And we were very elated that our negotiating position has been accepted by the Americans. But you can see his development also from another point of view that this must have been a ploy to create an impression that India is not among the ranks of the developing nations and, by alienating India which, of course, has matured, and I quite believe in the things my friend, the hon. Minister, has said about the preparation. Of course, India is a developing country, is much more qualified and much more potent in terms of preparing and representing the whole of the developing countries. But if we become part of that FIPS process, which we admit that it is not our creation, it is the creation of Americans, we have also to understand that politically the Americans are also interested in seeing that India stands divided from rest of the developing nations. So, whether this issue-based coalition approach is correct, or, whether we should have attempted to forge a wider coalition of all the developing countries, because what we understand in following

the process of negotiations and the positioning of the developed countries and the developing countries, the developed countries' strategy is two-fold. One is to isolate some of the stronger developing countries which have some kind of a muscle in the global trade, and, at the same time, some capability of preparedness to represent and lead the developing nations and the other is, put some sops for the least d veloped countries. So I think, we have to be watchful in terms of our negotiating tactics to really befriend the entire developing community rather than developing certain issue-specific coalitions with some of the countries.

Now, we come to the question of agriculture about which everbody has said and which the statement also, very correctly, focuses as the major area of concern. Seventy per cent of our people are dependent on agriculture. And the process which we are through is already creating a great crisis in agriculture. In 1950's, 56 per cent of our GDP was coming from agriculture, and the population dependent on agriculture was about 79 per cent. Today, the contribution from agriculture to our GDP has come down to 25 per cent, though the population dependent on agriculture is round about 69 per cent. So, it means that, comparatively, there has been an erosion of real income of people who are engaged in agriculture. So, as such, our agriculture is in crisis, and which is reflected. Everyday, we are hearing of farmers' suicides and all these things. So, in agriculture, which section of agriculture, which section of the population engaged in agriculture, whose interest will uphold in this negotiating process, that is the major national, political question that we have to address—whether it is agriculture, whether it is that community which is interested in having greater prospects for agricultural exports, or, is it the small and the marginal farmers, that is a political question on which the Government has to take a decision. I think, given the overall framework in which the Government is functioning, the Government's choice is very, very limited. The Government has to take a position in favour of the small and marginal farmers and the questions of food security, livelihood security have to be the central to our negotiating strategy in the matter of agriculture. Now, in agriculture, there is a mention of the Swiss formula. Now, it is also true, Sir, that we try to evolve some kind of an interim tactic of what you call the ABI formula, the Argentina, Brazil, India formula. But whether that formula also was adequate in really addressing our national interest is a question which is very much open. Because the basic problem here is, the pick rates are so diverse

that how do we do it. Now, here, we should be very, very clear that the tariff reduction should be in such a manner that there is some impact on the developed countries, but there is a little impact on the developing countries. Now, to what extent we can push the principle of disproportionality and how we can pose this issue in rallying the other developing countries is the heart of the negotiations in Hong Kong. Now, we believe that saying 'that there is an agreement around certain thing' may also imply foreclosing all our options. Now, it is true that developed countries will try to rally other developing countries and other smaller nations around their proposal, and we commit ourselves that this Swiss formula has become almost consensus, I think, maybe, on this issue, we are really tying our hands. So, there should be the principle of disproportionality, where developed countries reduce their tariff more as compared to the developing countries. This principle has to be accepted in the final outcome of the Doha Round. That is what we should try for. Similarly, in the developed countries, subsidies should go down. I was a little surprised because I don't find any mention of 'non-tariff barriers' in your statement. I think, it has been inadvertently missing. At least, that is what I hope. Because the way 'non-tariff barriers' have operated in neutralising some of the comparative advantages of the developing nations, which were agreed to in the earlier rounds, is a real negotiating point. Now, if we see the draft which has been released by the W.T.O., there is no mention of how and in what manner the non-tariff barriers will be reviewed and how and when, what will be the time-schedule for implemention and for the removal of those. I sincerely believe, I don't question or suspect the Government on this. But I was also a little surprised. So, this is one question where non-tariff barriers has to be a major bargaining counter for India and other developing countries to really push the developed countries on this whole question of tariff reduction or whatever concessions that we offered. I think, that is absolutely must, ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I mentioned 'unfair trade practices'.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I think, if you are specifying 'non-tariff barriers', that would have been more opt, because if you mention 'unfair trade practices', if dilutes the impact of the actual process on the trade prospects of the developing countries.

Then, there is this whole question of *de minimus* and the subsidy. Now, Sir, unfortunately, today, the situation is that day-in, day-out, we hear

lectures from friends and foes alike that there is too much of food subsidy in this country. But, actually, when we start trying to discuss this, we find that we cannot exhaust our available quota for *de-minimus* for providing subsidy to the really vulnerable sections, because of budgetary constraints. And now, since we know the usage of *de-minimus*, there is talk that yes, there could be some concessions on *de-minimus*. Now, the question is, on the one hand, we are saying that we are becoming a super power; we are growing by eight per cent and we have to grow up to ten per cent. Then, even it we have not been able to exhause *de-minimus*, because of the present financial constraints, that cannot be the logic for reducing de-minimus and offering that as a concession. I think, there is no question of offering any concession on the question of *de-minimus*; this is absolutely a no-no is so far as the negotiations are concerned and in so far as we are concerned.

Then, we come to the question of services. Now, in services also, there is a very dangerous line in the statement. Sir. The Minister will, please, bear with me. It is in the end of para 12 where he is saying. "In making our conditional efforts, we have not gone beyond the level of autonomous liberalisation in any of the sectors, while expanding sectoral and nodal coverage as compared to our Uruguay Round commitments."

Now, Sir, I can only recall a very contemporary issue on which we had a spact with the Government, that is, FDI in Telecom. Now, on Telecom, at that point of time, we had negotiated to open up only up to 49 *per cent*. Now, I am not arguing that we should have 74 per cent. But, instead of autonomously having such regulatory mechanism—that there would be violation and FDI would go beyound 49 per cent and then, post facto legitimising that to 74 per cent, this 74 per cent in FDI could have been a bargaining counter to Mr. Kamal Nath in the netotiations! So, this is a very, very dangerous line.

We are bragging that we have our regulatory mechanisms and regulatory oversights in place. And this is one example of how Government policies are used to sabotage our negotiating process. That day, when we were raising the question of 74 per cent in FDI in Telecom, we were within 'black and blue' -- 'you guys try to pull the country backwards.' Now, as you may see, this is one area where if autonomous decision-making could be synchronised with our negotiating process, we could have gained more.

5.00 P.M.

We could have offered a concession. Now, I believe, therefore, that these questions are very, very, important. Why this linkage with autonomous position and the negotiating position? We have to take a position, which is good and in the interest of our country; a position, which is good enough for us, which is good enough for the entire developing countries. That should be position. This linkage, I think, will unnecessarily create problems and it should be avoided at all costs.

Then, should we open up our social sectors like higher education and health? Dr. Joshi was arguing very passionately about it. Should we? I do not think so? Yes, in the field of knowledge, we can interact with others. We could have exchange programmes. But how can we open up areas like higher education or health in this country? Again and again, the same question remains.

So, that is one area, which, I think, is very, very important. Then, I think, one claim has been made in the statement, which is also factually not correct that there has been consultation with all the stakeholders. The financial sector, the trade unions are not being consulted.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I had a meeting with them yesterday, ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Not with the financial sector unions as far as I know ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I had meetings with trade unions and with the CITU.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Okay, I have no problem. You have not met with banking and insurance sector union. They are very big and independent unions like LIC, GIC, etc.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: They are part of the major trade unions.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: No. They are not their part. They are independent organisations. They are federations. Then on the TRIPs, what I would like to mention is that we have to raise the question of review. Whether we can succeed or not, it is a different question. But, then again, the question of review of TRIPs has to be linked with the question of implementation. What was the claim at that point of time when TRIPs were passed, and what is the actual effect, and what is the kind of trade flows that has taken

place? What are the kinds of benefits that have accrued to the developing countries? So, I think, India's negotiating position must include the demand for review of the TRIPs. Here, I think, it is very important that the question of health and the disease has been very aptly mentioned in the statement. It is: No need for any patient for medicines, which are used in critical diseases and shortening the period of patent for which it remains valid. That question has to come. This other question is the exclusion of patenting micro-organisms, non-biological and micro-biological processes. What you have suggested here can never be established--for example, from where the biological material has been derived; what is the source in the country, and how to put it on the package when it is being sold. These are the things, which are very, very difficult.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: It is 'when you are applying for the patent', not 'when it is sold'.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Anyway. Rather than that, every body knows that the south today, because of the climatic pattern, is a rich store-house of biological wealth. Now, if everybody is negotiating to leverage his strength, why the developing countries will not say that micro-organisms, micro-biological processes should be kept out of patenting. I don't understand it. Therefore, this is the point that I wanted to make. Finally, earlier this Schedule-V and Schedule-VI, which are very sensitive, were kept out of offer. We understand that the Government is thinking in terms of putting this also on offer. This will be totally contrary to the kind of things that we have been having in this country.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI) in the Chair.]

This is a negotiation which will have its impact on future generation of India--State Governments, their powers and their rights; even Panchayats, their powers and their rights; our autonomous councils and our people. Therefore, we have the entire support with the Government and we hope that all these that we have said is the spirit of true patriotism that will be borne in mind by the hon. Minister while he is negotiating. Our biggest strength is internally we have a huge domestic market. So, we should not allow ourselves to be brownbeaten by small countries in spite of their financial strength and muscles. I think, today, the size of the market that we have at out command is the biggest negotiating and bargaining counter that we have with us. It has to be borne in mind. If the developing countries

can be rallied--they ought to be rallied and India has the potential to assume that role in spearheading the counter offensive--we can do well in the negotiations, and, we, on behalf of our Party wish the Minister well to successfully negotiate and protect the interests of the country, as a whole.

Sir, I thank you for having given me the opportunity to speak on this issue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Thank you, Nilotpalji. Now, Mr. Santosh bagrodia.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (RAJASTHAN): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this matter. Sir, the hon. Minister has given a very, very exhaustive statement and I congratulate him for his representation in the WTO, which is far excellent. His discussions in the WTO are focussed and are in the interest of the country; I congratulate him for this. Sir, particularly, I would like to inform the hon. Minister that whatever our hon. Joshiji has said, please don't take that to your heart because he had a brief from somewhere in Nagpur. His future depends on that brief. He has mentioned many things about you but the entire country is with you. You go ahead...(Interruptions)

श्री रूद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): आज सुबह से ही मैं बहुत शांति से बैठा हूं, झंडेवाला और नागपुर, इन सबका उत्तर मैं दे सकता हूं ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Our best wishes are with you. You are doing a good job.

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दिनेश त्रिवेदी): बागड़ोदिया जी, आप मेहरबानी करके अपनी बात कहते जाइए ...(व्यवधान)...please carry on.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: You are doing a good job and we have full confidence that you will continue to do a good job. You have given a detailed and exhaustive statement that clarifies many points. But it also provokes for many clarifications. We do understand that the next meeting in Hong Kong is basically the development round for the developing countries. Sir, I don't want to repeat as to why WTO was established. It ws entirely due to the needs of the developed countries; to export their surpluses either industrial or agricultural produces. It has happened. It cannot be reversed. We have to fit in ourselves in the best possible manner.

Sir, you have mentioned about agricultural farmers, you have mentioned about service industries, you have also mentioned about industrial goods relating to large industries. But, there is a very passing reference to small

scale, tiny and rural industries in para 11 of your statement. So, firstly, I would like to take up the cause of the small and the rural industries.

Joshiji was mentioning about duty cuts. Sir, if you remember what these Governments have done from 1998 to 2004, it is there Government which has reduced the industrial tariffs from 35 per cent to nearly 14 per cent. I do not know under what circumstances they did it, how was it considered advantageous to the local industries, local workers. But they did it. And, now they are trying to give us sermons that it should not be done. I would like to understand from the hon. Minister that even now why cannot we increase the import tariffs for industrial goods at the highest level available under WTO rules. And, if so, what is your opinion, by when you want to do it? Are you going to ...(*Interruption*)... It is not possible. You must realise that there is large sickness, very large number of industrial units have gone sick after this reduction in the import duties. And, this affects the small and tiny industries equally. That means, more unemployment, which is hurting the interests of the country very badly. You are well aware that already our small and rural industries are facing a number of domestic constraints, particularly, lack of infrastructure and complexity of domestic taxation, whereas 40 per cent of production depends on this sector and 39 per cent depend on this section. I hope, you will take all necessary steps to ensure that livelihood of small and vulnerable amongst us is not further jeopardised. Hon. Textiles Minister is sitting here. You know, Sir, how important the textile industry is; what important role it plays for exports from our country. I believe, 29 per cent of exports of our country are only from the textile sector. But, because of these WTO regulations, because of import duties, which are at much higher levels, export of the textile industry is also affected. I am sure our hon. Minister will consider this aspect while discussing with the WTO authorities.

Sir, coming to agriculture, we all know that 200 million farming communities are still living with minimum nutrition. This is the most important and vulnerable community. Any small pressure on the resources or livelihood will create doubts about their survival itself. We do appreciate your assurance which you have given many times that interests of the Indian farmers will always be protected while negotiating with WTO. We all know that over 60 per cent of farmers are still owning less than one hectare of land and their average daily earning is less than two dollars. Most of you do not know, Sir, that I started my own

life as a farmer. Way back in 1960, I started my career in tea plantation in Assam. I spent many months and years there and I know how much even an organised sector like tea plantation depends on the natural rainfall and also on sunshine. But, if we think of the ordinary farmer, his plight is mind-boggling. A large part of cultivated area in our country is rain-fed, allowing limited crops to be grown only in dry lands. You have to take very special care whenever the Indian negotiating team discusses this issue. You have mentioned in your statement that the instruments of special products and the special safeguard mechanism have been agreed in the Framework Agreement of August 2004. It is important to ensure that this instrument provides effective protection to these rural people. I have following questions for this sector. What are the steps taken by India to pursue the goals in the WTO negotiations of eliminating the trade distortions and surplus production resulting from the huge amounts of subsidies provided by some major developed countries to their farmers? Will the proposals by the main subsidisers secure real cuts in the currently applied levels of support provided by them to their farming sector? Which are the countries that are standing by India on making trade in agriculture fair and equitable? India has only tariff to safeguard their farming community against import of subsidised products from developed countries.

I would like to remind Joshiji who is not here that it was their Government which imported sugar in large quantities when we had surplus sugar. और इनका मारा हुआ आज तक दुखी है। The sugarcane farmers still cannot live happily, are not able to survive because of them. It was because of them that so much sugar was imported that the entire country's sugar market went into glut. Till now, we are facing the same situation, and they are taking about the interest of the country. They brought the rates of sugar import to zero. Can anyone explain this? Why did that Government do it? Sir, the developed countries, particularly E.U. countries, are raising the issue of phytosanitary and other sanitary issues. They are putting non-tariff barriers to import farm products from India; they are putting very stringent standards.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you were present in the last meeting when friends came from, I guess, the U.K. and some other countries, and we discussed this issue. You were also present, Sir. But let me tell you that none of these developed countries has any sympathy for developing

countries, particularly India. I had the privilege of joining a meeting in. Sir, I thought we had half-an-hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I just want to remind my presence here as well. You don't have half-an-hour. I understand the hon. Minister is coming at 5.30 p.m. from the Lok Sabha.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Sir, it has been converted into a discussion for two and a half hours or something.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): I am just going by what I have been told. So, I will appreciate if you could kindly conclude.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: I doubt whether I can do it that fast. But give me some more time. The first speaker has taken about forty minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): We have five more speakers. Please, carry on.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Anyway, I will try to complete fast. Let us not waste time on this. Sir, what I was trying to say was about these developed countries. I was in Singapore for the WTO discussions of Commonwealth Countries. They have absolutely no generosity. Countries like Australia, the U.K., or any other European Countries. They simply mentioned, "You bother about yourself. We are going to follow this system." We have to understand whether we need them more or they need us more. I strongly believe that they need us more than we need them. They are aiming at the vast markets of our country.

I quickly come to the service sector, Sir. We have increased, your statement has mentioned, it to 51 billion dollars from 24 billion dollars. This is entirely due to the entrepreneurial abilities of the Indian community and, of course, the policies of the present Government. We have hard-working, English-speaking, and educated population; we have a great advantage in services because of our large educated and trained population. Therefore, our core objectives rightly are liberalisation of Mode 1 (Cross Border Supply) and Mode 4 (Movement of Natural Persons).

Sir, when I talk about natural persons, I remember, there was a time when an ordinary thing like Indian cooks were freely allowed to go to any European country on the recommendation of the Indian restaurants there. Even that has been stopped. I don't know why. Indian food requires a great

expertise. It is not like European or American food which is frozen, and just warmed up and taken. This is made fresh with the expertise in love and affection.

I request the hon. Minister to take up this case very strongly so that whenever we go there, we can have good food.

Similarly, Sir, the movement of goods is desired freely by these people. If they desire the movement of goods freely, why should they not allow the movement of people freely? What has been your approach to address these problems more effectively? I know the success is very limited. Rather, I should say, there is no success so far. I am just trying to skip many of the points because the Vice-Chairman is telling me to stop it. Sir, when we talk about non-tariff barriers, another barrier they put in is child labour in the carpet industry. I think, all of us know that in the most developed countries, children coming from the middle-class families, even higher middle class families and lower middle class families, they start working at the age of 12. They all do part time work at the age of 12 to support them partially, and if they can start doing work at this early age, where is the scope for asking that child labour is such a big problem in our country? How can they question what is happening in our country? Recently, I think, the court has said that marriageable age for women can be 15 years, and for men, can be 18 years or something like that. That means our children are growing very fast, they are maturing faster, and if these children are not employed in various sectors, including carpet industry, what will happen. They will become vegabonds, they will become criminals Are these developed countries going to save us from this kind of criminals who will be available all over the country? We have to think from these angles; we have to explain these angles to these developed countries in our discussons.

Sir, the last point I want to mention is that the developed countries are trying to create division among the developing countries, and least developed countries, by giving concessions to the LDCs. While India must support the issue of LDCs on principle, at the same time, it must take a lead in maintaining the unity of the developing countries, and if this unity is maintained, no power on the earth can stop us from achieving our goal, and our goal is not for India alone. Our goal is for the entire humanity all over the world; our goal is for every citizen in every developing

country, whether it is in Africa, whether it is in Asia or whether it is in some parts of Europe or the U.S.A., this will be the goal in respect of which India has to take a lead. If India wants to become a super power, we must dare to take this lead, and must dare to take this decision. I am sure, under the leadership of our variable Minister, we will be able to take this lead. I am sure, under the able leadership of our Prime Minister, we can achieve this goal. I wish best of luck, and I congratulate the hon. Minister once more. Here, I would like to mention what Shri Nilotpal Basu has mentioned that this is the first time when the Minister is discussing these issues before going to the meeting. I want to draw the attention of Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi, who is not present in the House, to one thing. They have gone many times for such meetings. Have they ever discussed these issues in the Parliament before going to such meetings? Now, he wants to put constraints. These double standards are not going to work. Whatever has to be done at the international level, this Government is capable, this Minister is capable of doing that, and they will do that in the best interests of the country. With these words, I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Thank you, Bagrodiaji, Shri Arjun Kumar Sengupta. I believe this is his maiden speech.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Unfortunately or fortunately, this is not my maiden speech. I had spoken once before when I was raising the issue of...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): But, maybe, when I am in the Chair, it is maiden!

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): But, in any case, this is a very major issue, and I am very glad that I got the opportunity to speak on this subject. The importance of this subject is not reflected by the attendance here. I am afraid, the Minister is also not here. But it is very true that this is, probably, the first time we have had a chance to discuss the issues relating to this debate on WTO before the debate takes place at Hongkong. Fortunately, for us, we have been represented on this forum by previous Ministers who were very able. I can see Mr. Jaitley sitting over here. He had a wonderful innings in negotiating the Indian case in the WTO last time; he should be congratulated. And today, we have got Mr. Kamal Nath who has given a gist of the lines that he is

going to follow. And appearing from that, it is really going to be very helpful.

Sir, I want to point out two things first. We first realise that no Government going to have a negotiation like this can commit itself fully; it can only take into amount certain general principles because, as it happens, the Government will have to form coalitions, will have to negotiate with other countries, and what would be the final positions will not necessarily be the position which is absolutely the first best for India. I am mentioning this because I am fully aware of Joshiji's point that certain privileges the Americans have, which we don't have. The Americans set the parameters of the game; we don't. But we have to deal with that together with others. In other words, coalition formation is the basis of these negotiations. My friend, Mr. Nilotpal Basu, pointed out that we should try to form coalitions will all parties across the board. That is also not feasible because there are a lot of differences among the countries. We have to form issue specific, and that is exactly what Mr. Kamal Nath is doing; 'exact groups for exact issues', and that is the right approach to follow in these kinds of negotiations. So, we should be realistic; we should not expect that something will happen, which will immediately change the whole international trade framework. We have to move step by step on the assumption that we all accept that the WTO is a good thing; we should try to make the maximum use of that.

Having said that, I want to refer to one comment of Shri Kamal Nath, which I saw not in this paper, but in one of his website's presentations where he assured that "I shall accept a Lakshman rekha. I can do many things; I can get into many agreements, but I shall not cross that Lakshman rekha." It is that Lakshman rekha which we can discuss in the Parliament that beyond this, he cannot go. And as regards that Lakshman rekha, if Mr. Kamal Nath was there, I would have reminded him that he is now representing a Government which is not a Government which believes in trade liberalisation for the sake of trade liberalisation. It believes in trade liberalisation to have this clear aim; any liberalisation has a clear aim whether it affects *aam janata*, the poor and the people of our country. I am mentioning this because the first test he will face in agriculture. Now, let me put to you and, through you, to the Minister—I hope somebody will take note of this—that in agriculture our interest is not so much in exports.

Brazil has a much better interest in exports. We do have some interest in that and in several items we can have, probably, over a period of time. But our problem, our interest, is how to protect us and how to protect our from a surge of imports. Now, we are not against imports. When the negotiations start, whether the Americans and EU come to an agreement on subsidies or not—they, probably, will have to finally arrive at some kind of an understanding—but they will demand opening up of our markets. How far are you prepared to open up our markets? And that is the test because, in many of our agricultural products, the people who are concerned are vey poor agriculturists, and if they are affected by that, it will have a major impact on the so-called aam janata and we can't allow to do that.

Let me give you a very simple example, wheat. If it is Punjab wheat, it is perfectly competitive in the world. But if it is in Karnataka, price is much higher. If you freely allow import of wheat, Karnataka will import from outside and the Punjab wheat-growers will have no market. It is the situation which we have to face if we don't have a complete level playing field, when there are no high transport costs and no other transaction costs. Whenever we are opening up our markets—I am pointing this thing out because I should not be misunderstood that I am against imports—we must realise what is the effect of that on the cultivators who are the major backbone of our country. There are several other similar areas. So, the first request that I make, through you, Sir, to the Minister is to list the commodities where, if we open up, their effect will be enormous on the cultivators and the people. I have not seen any such a list. I don't know that will be the effect of opening up the different agricultural commodities and on the poor people or the cultivators and how much they will suffer. This is the first study that you will have to make and then decide on the basis of that, how much you can open.

The second point, and this is a point which, again, I would like the Minister to take note of, is that the trade policy is not an isolated policy in international economics. Trade policy is an element of overall economic policy. The moment you agree to open up certain areas in agriculture, which you may have to because of international pressure and because of the compulsions of coalition, you must be able to give the country an alternative programme to help the cultivators, to help the people, who are being affected. In other words, any kind of trade opening must be associated

with a policy programme to help the people who are being affected by this. I am putting it to Mr. Kamal Nath because he has not, probably, done this exercise. He will go there. But he must keep in mind that this is the demand that will be put on him. Whatever negotiations he may make, he must be able to protect the people of the country.

Let me come very quickly to one more subject, the services. Now, I am afraid, too much is being made of M-1 and M-4. Some numbers have been given, 200 billion dollars, etc. Some Boston company has made this estimate. I doubt it very much. I can challenge this thing, if it is produced there. The number appears to be too fussy and I can challenge it. But let me forget it how. What does it imply? In the case of foreigners using our places, it is in their interest. The Americans and the Europeans are interested in making use of our talents. There are some problems within those countries. There are political problems and some of their people will lose jobs. But ultimately capitalism thrives. I must take it for certain that they would see to it, in some form or the other, that they make use of our people, which is cheap.

Now, if they do that, and if you consider that to be a great victory of ours, then, I would say, "Do not think so; it is the nature of their position."

Similarly, on the question of people going abroad, it is very well that our young people should be allowed to go abroad. But the number mentioned is 69,000. Okay; 69,000 becomes 6,90,000 in five years, which means that 6,90,000 Indians will go abroad, will become rich and will, probably, send 30 per cent of their income back to India. Ours is a country of thousand million population, and this figure is nothing. I am not saying that I am against it. But, please don't think that services mean only these two things. There are much more important services than that. The services are now growing in our country at 7-8 per cent. The world is looking at the Indian market of services. They want to enter the service market; be it, the insurances banking or health, whatever services that you are talking about, the world is keen to enter there, and you must have a negotiating hand there. You must be able to say that you can come provided you do something to help our poor. We cannot put any export obligation on them now. That is out. We cannot even say that they must have so many crores of actual output to be used. But, you can still put a number of conditions; like, they have to 10 per cent of their capital only to help, teach, design, provide training to our people, our retailers, who are the

poor competitors exporting these products. What I am saying is that in the services trade, we have an opening; we have not made any kind of a binding obligation which has made it difficult for us now to have export obligations on other things. You must keep it in mind and should be able to treat the services properly.

Sir, one final point. I have many other points, but I don't want to take much time. This one pertains to NAM manufacturers. There is no tariff problem so far. It is entirely a problem of not-tariff barrier. I am afraid I don't see that awareness. I think, Shri Nilotpal Basu also mentioned it. Now, how exactly are you approaching the non-tariff barriers? That must be the most important area of our negotiations with the West. We are willing to open up because India's industrial tariff rates are still quite high; it should be brought down. It has already come down in the last two years; it should be brought down further. But this should be used as a chip to get something very clear from the other party in terms of access to their manufacturing areas in the context of the complete change of these non-tariff barriers.

Sir, I just wanted to make these three points. You have to keep these three points. You have to keep these three points in mind when you go for the negotiations.

Thank you very much.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): Sir, my distinguished colleague, Dr. Joshi, has already very elaborately placed the concens which my party has, and which indeed this country has, in relation to the on-going negotiations on the eve of the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference of the WTO. There are a few points which I wish to add to what Dr. Joshi has already said. The latest draft agreement proposed to be adopted, which is still at the draft stage dated 1st December, 05, has been made public, and I have had an opportunity to examine that draft and also discuss it with the hon. Minister. Needless to say, as the Minister himself indicated, in the course of his statement, in the absence of any specific agreement so far, the draft does not indicate a very high level of ambition for settlement in the talks at Hong Kong itselt and, Hong Kong, therefore, is likely to be more a ware station on a way to an ultimate negotiation, which is going to be held. And, as the Minister himself has indicated, that may be some time next year because a lot of specificities are not likely to come about at Hong Kong itself.

Why is it that the last one or two Ministerials are increasingly witnessing situations which are unable to produce an agreed draft with specificities? The concern across parties that has been expressed is that the WTO, even a decade ago, was increasingly an organisation which was driven by the concerns of the United States and the European Union. When the United States and the European Union laid down the agenda and drove that agenda in the WTO, most countries, including the LDCs normally fell in line with what these two economic powers had stated.

There are two-three changes which have since then taken place in the situation. These changes have some reflection also on the stand which India has taken. India has increasingly, even when in a situation of isolation, shown a lot of grit and determination to stand by its stand. This was shown and demonstrated by India at Doha itself. Therefore, we acquired a situation for the first time in the WTO where the Indian stand could not be ignored. The second important change which has taken place is that India, along with Brazil, South Africa, Argentina and China, was amongst the foremost nations which started forming alliances and coalitions particularly in the contest of the agricultural negotiations. And G-20, which was a coalition - which is primarily led by these five large developing countries - of a large number of developing countries, also brought about a significant change in the balance of the WTO negotiations. The original balance which was predominantly US-and-EU-driven, got somewhat checked with the formation of the G-20, and G-20 had an important voice as far as the agricultural negotiations were concerned. And it is really this phenomena of G-20, which is today laying down increasingly the agenda for negotiations. When I say this, this is demonstrated by the fact that the agenda originally used to be in favour of market access being given to the subsidising nations. When we speak in terms of developed nations and developing nations. I think a more correct use of phraseology in the context of agricultural negotiations also could be that the world today is divided amongst two categories of countries, those who subsidise agriculture and those who are not able to subsidise agriculture. Those who subsidise agriculture obviously wanted the core area of negotiation be given as the market access to subsidise the agriculture. And as Mr. Nilotpal very rightly said that India's *deminimis* can go up to ten per cent but today we are able, because of our own economic constraints, to only utilise about two to three per cent of it. Even if we increased it five times, we would still be in

the area of the permitted subsidy to our farmers. But it is due to our own economic constraints that we are not able to do it.

Therefore, the shift in the agenda took place and that shift in agenda has been accompanied by a very strong and political argument, the argument being that the subsidising nations have distorted the agricultural market the world over; they have distorted it by subsidising agriculture in a big way, to the extent of almost 400 billion dollars a year, more than a billion dollar per day; and, therefore, when the United States and the European Union subsidise their agriculture in various ways, the effect is that their farmer has an incentive to produce more; he is subsidised by the State; his product is cheaper; for exporting it, he gets a further subsidy. Therefore, the State starts subsidising his agricultural production. As against this, when he has to compete with the non-subsidised agriculture in the world, their prices do not match and, therefore, even if we have a surplus agriculture, it keeps rotting in the godowns of the Food Corporation of India, it does not find a world market at those prices and, effectively, the competition, therefore, is not even between the developed and the developing countries, it is not even only amongst the subsidising countries and the non-subsidising countries, but really our farmer, whom we are not able to subsidise, has then to compete with the Treasury Secretary of the United States or the Finance Minister of any of the developed economies or the subsidising economies who is able to subsidise his agriculture. Now, it is this distortion which has actually led to global proverty in the case of agriculture also. And, I think, one of the important developments in the history of the WTO has been that rather than the United States and the European Union merely dicate the agenda of greater market access for their subsidised agriculture, I have been following the statements which the hon. Minister has been making in the last few days, as a spokesman both for India and the G-20 we have been able to alter the global agenda and link these two factors, as far as agriculture is concerned. There is no question of opening out, and opening out to subsidised agriculture, the effect of which will be; today we are protecting ourselves with the shield that we cannot subsidise our farmers, and we will not allow a subsidised agriculture to come and drive our farmer to a state of destitution. The other being that such a situation can arise, if at all; only at the state when the world market is even, that these trade distorting subsidies have been removed globally. Now, what is the position,

as far as this situation is concerned? And, it is here that I wish to sound a slight note of caution, as far as the hon. Minister is concerned. Globally, subsidies have been divided into various categories by the developed countries itself. The most obvious case of a trade-distorting subsidy is export subsidy, *i.e.*, you subsidise your farmer in case he is able to export more. So, if he is able to go and crush the non-subsidised products in developing countries, or, poor countries, you pay your farmer in order to send his products increasingly into other countries of the world. Now, there has been no debate, at all, on this issue because only one view is possible that this is the most trade-distroting character of a subsidy. Now, in the Doha Round, we had already agreed, and the Doha Declaration categorically said, "Reduction leading to eventual elimination of the export subsidy itself". Therefore, in the course of the Doha Round, the faster we achieve the elimination of export subsidy, the better it is, and that would be in compliance with the agreed spirit of the Doha Development Round. But, today, we are in the situation that even the last agreement, that is, the Geneva Agreement which we had on agriculture on 31st of July, 2004, it indicates that the United States and the Eurpoean Union are still bargaining and haggling over the date into which these eliminations are to be made. For instance, I have already separately discussed it with the hon. Minister, the elimination of this even in the drafting of the language, because this was an agreed text and this is where I wish to sound a note of caution, that the kind of reduction in some of these subsidies, I think, will have to be hastened out. Therefore, when export subsidies date is to be bargained, there is no additional cost that we have to put. I say additional cost because there is a basic distinction between the WTO as an organisation and various other multilateral institutions, like the United Nations and other institutions, whereas other institutions will always take care of the political weight and the moral case of the argument, the WTO does not recognise any such argument. It is an economic market; it is bazaar, wherefor, whatever you give, you have to levy a price; and whatever you get from others, you have to pay a price for it. Therefore, in case, today, we are asked for eventual elimination of export subsidies, the Doha Declaration itself included a price when we agreed on TRIPs and various other things, which was inbuilt into the Declaration. Therefore, no additional cost had to be but upon the world for elimination of those subsidies.

Sir, the second area of concern which I have is, that the other domestic support which is split up into various categrories. Let me take an obvious case of a trade-distorting category, or, as we call it, these are divided into three areas, they call it, the Green Box, the Blue Box and the Amber Box. Now, what has been happening in the course of these negotiations is that as a substitute to eventual reduction of the total amount, the jugglery of changing boxes goes on. What is the amount that the United States is today giving to its farmer? After this Agreement, will that amount actually, start coming down and be eliminated, or, in the jugglery of changing colour of those boxes, the amount will remain the same?

For instance, the amber box is like you pay our farmer in order to grow more. So, he has an incentive to grow more; since it is subsidised agriculture, it will travel all across the world, and therefore gives competition to the non-subsidised agriculture, enter various markets, and even if it does not enter markets for instance, in India, so far, we have been substantially successful in preventing its entry into the Indian market; but then, our surplus keeps lying dumped in our own market because it has no place in the global market; it cannot compete with this. Therefore, our prices get depressed because the U.S. and the E.U. give subsidies to their farmers.

For instance, the first category, obviously the trade distorting subsidy, is, you pay your farmer in order to grow more. The second category is the blue box. In the blue box category, you pay your farmer not to grow, to keep his land vacant. In any case, it leads to his own enrichment. The green box itself is ostensibly for environment protection, protection of cattle, animals, etc. Eventually, will this amount go down which is given to this or will it not go down? And, if it does not go down, I am referring only on agiculture and I intend to speak only on agriculture because that is the foremost concern, core of these negotiations. And that is the primary concern that we have in India today because in other areas the negotiations do not seem to be moving at a faster pace.

The agreements which we have been reaching on the eve of Hong Kong, some of them have some disturbing trends inbuilt into them. For instance, let us take the blue box itself. The blue box is trade distorting. But in the Geneva Agreement of 2004, it starts the blue box paragraph by a sentence,"Members recognise the role of blue box in promoting agricultural

reforms."Then it says, 'The above criterion for blue box entry alongwith addditional criteria will be negotiated." So,more additions can be brought into the blue box itself.

If more entries are to be brought into, if more categories are to be brought into the blue box, that leads to an 'expanded' blue box. Therefore, even if you say that today the blue box has a hundred, and by expanding it, I will add forty and make it hundred and forty, and then reduce hundred and forty by 20 per cent, there is no effective reduction which takes place, the amount of money going into the pocket of the American farmer or the British farmer itself increases. Therefore, there is a great need to make sure that in these agreements that we have, we are able to substantially cut down the actual amount.

The green box for instance, in the entire negotiations as of today, and that is a great danger which we must be cautions of in Hong Kong itself, the last agreed paragraph says, "Green box criteria will be reviewed and clarified with a view of ensuring that green box measures have no or at most minimal trade distorting effects on production. So, green box is almost being treated as non-trade-distorting. Therefore, even if the green box subsidies are agreed to be increased they will not be added to the sum total of what is to be reduced. I am referring to it, Sir, because though it sounds slightly technical, the real danger lies that effectively if green box is outside the reduction commitments, if blue box is capable of expansion, then in the rest, even if there is an overall reduction, the amount of money going into the right pocket of the farmer will be reduced and the amount of money going into the left pocket of the farmer will be increased, and thereafter the effective reduction may not take place.

The second danger, Sir, which is an important area and I just wish to caution the hon. Minister about, is, that whatever be our commitments in the matter of reducing our tariff, they have to be taken with utmost seriousness. In India, where more than 600 million people are dependent on agriculture for livelihood, the situation with regard to agriculture would be that there are hundreds of tariff lines as far as agriculture is concerned. Even if there is a flow into India because of reduced tariffs, let us say half a dozen tariff lines, the impact of this is going to be on millions of farmers.

For example, today, just to give the data, I rechecked with the hon.

Minister two days ago when I had a chance to meet him, and I am sure he is conscious of this factor when I mentioned it to him, and I do appreciate the concern he had when this was discussed with him, that we have 695 tariff lines in agriculture.

If we look at the big picture, our tariffs, which are permissible tariffs or the bound rates, come to an average of 114 per cent. Our applied rate is only about 35 per cent. Now the G-20 has given a proposal that in case tariffs are reduced by developed countries, we will reduce up to two-third of that tariff which effectively means that we will reduce 36 per cent of our tariff. So, if on a larger average we take it that out of 114, we reduce by it by 36 per cent, it appears that on arithmetical total our markets will still remain protected. But within those 695 lines, there are several tariff lines where the breathing space or the headspace that we have between the applied tariffs and the bound tariff is very small and those will fall below the red mark. Now the moment those fall below the red market and you have a dozen such tariff lines where inflow to foreign agriculture comes in, then there is going to be chaos in several areas where it happens. If we have a pact with Sri Lanka—Free Trading Pact—and Indonesian black pepper enters Kerala through the Sri Lankan Free Trade Agreement,—just one black pepper that is one of the 695 commodities can create a serious problem in one State, rubber can create a problem in another State. These are all areas where, therefore, we have to very carefully weigh. Therefore, my suggestion to the hon. Minister has been, which I offer him through this House, that under no circumstances must we delink tariff reduction from subsidy reduction.

The two are main pillars on which the agriculture negotiations rest, and the two, therefore, must have to be linked together... One defect which I found in July 2004 Agreement which I had pointed to the hon. Minister and I had a comment on it in the media also that we agreed on a certain level of subsidy reduction and left the tariff reduction to be negotiated later. The moment we do that, we lose our handle as far as first is concerned. But, the two are interlinking and in the two in a country like India, as Mr. Sengupta very rightly mentioned, and even our friends in G-20 like Brazil, we have slightly different interests. Today we are both together in the matter of an aggressive approach against subsidy. But our approach on tariff reduction may be different because Brazil has an aggressive interest on tariff reduction and market access, we still have a

6.00 P.M.

defensive interest as far as market access in concerned. Therefore, we have to watch our own interests in agriculture and in case in the case of agriculture there is no significant and substantial reduction in subsidies, the matter of tariff reduction will have to be linked with it and should not be allowed to make any headway. I must say that I have had repeated discussion with the hon. Minister and I have gone through some of the statements he has been making, he will, therefore, have to pursue the trust of some of the statements he has been making. And this July 2004 Agreement, I think, in certain points, was not best strategy. We will also have to use Hong Kong as an opportunity to try and somehow to get out of it, in case the West, particularly the European Union and the United States are not in a position to make a substantial reduction in subsidy itself. Sir, we hope in the course of this discussion and the discussion the hon. Minister is having, he is aware, he is aware of the broad consensus of national sentiments and views on this issue. We wish him all the best in trying to protect our interests, particularly the economic interests of the country in Hong Kong. Thank you.

SHRI R. SARATH KUMAR (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, many speakers before me have made their views clear to the hon Minister who will be leaving tomorrow. I do not know how far we are going to get our points through to the Minister. His statement itself very clearly states that depth in which he has gone through the entire problems of products and the subsidies, which are involved. Though there are a lot of areas to be discussed, I would confine to agriculture, which is not only a great concern to our party but the entire country. Sir, agriculture is a way of life in our country and it will continue to remain the mainstay of socio-economic development of our country.

Seventy per cent of our population, about 710 million people in India are dependent on agriculture, for their livelihood. Here, I would like to state that the farmers' income is rising at the rate of 1.5 per cent but the expenditure is increasing at the rate of four per cent. The total short-term credit requirement for agriculture in the country is approximately 23.5 billion dollars. But, the financial institutions are able to provide only 12 to 14 per cent of this requirement. There is a very vast shortfall. So the farmers are forced to go to private bankers or private financers. Sir, the average debt of an Indian farmer household is Rs. 12,585. Even if the

farmer clears his loan in a year he is left with a shortfall and the question of survival becomes a very big question in his life. Sir, in the last few years, over 4000 Indian farmers have committed suicide due to the vicious circle of debt. Your may wonder why I am going into these sorts of details. I know the constraint of time. But our main concern is agriculture. The farmers' issue is a very major issue as far as ministerial conference is concerned. Sir, India and many developing countries joined the WTO with the hope of reducing the hardships of our farmers by expanding trade with developing countries. The agreement on agriculture, is primarily based on the understanding that the market disparities in the agricultural sector would be removed by (a) disciplining of export subsidies; (b) reduction of domestic support; and (c) provision of free market access. Mr. Jaitley has elaborately shown the disparities of the subsidies in the developed countries and the subsidies in the developing countries. Sir, it is widely accepted that the developed countries have not implemented the agreement in its true spirit. This poses a great challenge to the developing countries like India. The developed countries have adopted the high tariff route to block agricultural exports from the developing countries. Tariffs remain very high in case of cereals, sugar and dairy products. While the average tariffs of the developed countries on non-agricultural items range below five per cent, tariff on agricultural products vary from eleven per cent to twenty three per cent. There was a period, when there was a restriction on quantity of agricultural products in the country. Now, having withdrawn the quantity of restrictions, it has reduced the tariff on commodities which has opened the Indian markets. Cheaper imports of skimmed milk, milk powder, edible oils, sugar, tea, arecanut, apples, coconut and a host of other items have flooded the Indian market. This has resulted in the fall in domestic prices of commodities and the burden has fallen on the small and marginal farmers. The developed countries have protected their huge subsidies on agriculture and dumped their cheaper commodities in countries like India. Here I would like to give some statistics for the Minister to make a note of it. A published report states that since the inception of WTO, there is a steep fall in the prices of agricultural commodities in the world markets. The international prices of 18 major export commodities have fallen by 25 per cent, in real terms, between 1980 and 2000. The decline has been steep in the case of cotton, which is 47 per cent, coffee, which is 64 per cent, rice which is 61 per cent, cocoa which is 71 per cent and sugar which is 77 per cent.

International cotton price per Pound came down from 128 US Cents in 1981 to 38.7 US Cents per Pound in 2002. Similarly, rice prices came down from 565 US Dollars per tonne in 1981 to 160.8 US Dollars per tonne in 2002 and sugar prices came down from 18.11 US Cents per Pound in 1981 to 5.68 US Cents per Pound in 2002. The major cause of this can be attributed to the lower prices of the commodity exports by developed countries. The OECD data shows that in the 25 OECD countries, the total support estimate, a measure of domestic support, rose from US Dollars 275.6 billion to US Dollars 326 billion in 1999 while US has given a fresh subsidy of US Dollars 190 billion in 2002 under the US Farm Bill, 2002. In another Report, the 2003 US figures show that agricultural exports from the US were sold at a much below the cost of production. This is where the problem arises. The subsidy given in the USA, helps the farmers to export their products more efficiently than from our country. Sir, wheat was exported at an average price of 28 per cent. It was below the cost of production. Cotton was exported at an average price of 47 per cent. It was also below the cost of production. Rice was exported at an average price of 26 per cent. It was also below the cost of production. So, on the whole, it is evident that the developed countries do not want to make any concessions on their reduction commitments on domestic support and export subsidies, but on the contrary, would like the developing countries to open their markets for them. Hence, the apprehensions and doubts of the Indian farming community on the WTO Agreement on Agriculture need to be seriously and urgently addressed. The fear in the minds of the farmers in our country has to be totally eradicated. They should feel secure.

Sir, another Report—UN Human Development Report 2005 — say that the developed countries' support to agricultural production now stands at a staggering US $ 350 billion which is approximately US $ 1 billion a day... (*Time-bell*)... Sir, you should give me more time. Earlier speakers have been given almost half-an-hour to forty-five minutes. I will make it very brief.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): We unfortunately, do not have much time and the hon. Minister has to reply.

SHRI R. SARATH KUMAR: I will not waste your valuable time. I understand that the hon. Minister has to go tomorrow. The real beneficiaries of these subsidies given by the USA are not small and poor farmers but

large corporate agri-business outfits, big farmers and landowners. It is reported that only 20 per cent of US $ 1 billion per day goes to poor farmers of USA and the remaining goes to others. I feel, I would recommend, through you, to the hon. Minister that he should demand for outright scrapping of the 80 per cent of the subsidies given to large farmers. Hence, India should necessarily insist that, besides reducing agricultural subsidies, they should be classified under two categories: one which benefits small farmers, and the remaining which goes to agri-business companies and the farmers/land owners.

Before I conclude, after hearing all the observations made by all the hon. Members here, I would like to emphasise and would like to tell the hon. Minister that India should take a tough stand like that of my mentor and our former Minister of Commerce, Shri Murasoli Maranji, in the Doha meet, with special safeguard mechanisms before coming to any decisions in the forthcoming Ministerial conference at Hong Kong, keeping in mind the interests and the plight of the 700 million people of this country whose lives depend on agriculture.

All the best to the hon. Minister for this Conference. Thank you.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Sir, I am very grateful to the earlier speakers who have spoken at length on this very important subject and try to strengthen the hands of the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry. And, Sir, I have the privilege of having interacting with him, in person. We have had several rounds of discussions across the board and I know his mental make up how to defend the interests of the nation. I am sure, to the best of his ability he will, certainly, try to do that. I am under no illusion. I must confess it to you that I don't have any illusions, that with the passage of time, within these ten and odd years *i.e.*, from 1st January, 1995, to this day, there has been some amendments to the agenda of the WTO. Primarily, the agenda of the WTO has been, to my understanding, to promote the interests of the advanced/developed countries, particularly the USA and the three EU countries. However, you may say, with the passage of time, after the Doha round, after the Seattle and the Cancun failure we have been able to push our agenda. That is, perhaps, an illusion that we have not been able to. In fact, to my understanding, the WTO is a corollary of the Washington consensus. The only difference is in Washington

consensus the major decisions have to be taken by majority vote of 85 per cent where 17 per cent of the entire 100 per cent vote held by the USA. It holds 17 per cent of the vote and the advanced developed countries hold 49 per cent of the vote. Whereas there is some difference in the WTO. The decisions will be taken by consensus. So, every country has a chance to speak for itself. So, Sir, I was just going through a very interesting Report of the ILO, not doctored by us. It was the Report of the ILO. It says like this.

"The Washington Consensus, one of the important dispensations, is to move the subsidy from labour to capital, and taxes from capital to labour". That is one of the very interesting subsidy mechanisms, which is being advocated in the Washington Consensus. Another very important thin is that there will be no policy, the policies are to be dismantled. This is also one of the dispensations. So is true in the WTO also, where subsidy has to move from the developing or under developed countries to the developed countries by some jugglery or the other - this green box says, amber box says, blue box says. Therefore, insofar as agriculture is concerned to my understanding—I am sure that you will also agree with me that in our country agriculture is not a corporate-driven industry. It is not profit-making. corporate- driven, where multinationals 'huge capitals have been deployed. Here, in our country, very fortunately, or, unfortunately, the agriculture is a livelihood. It is a question of lives and deaths of millions and millions of people. Therefore, while we are going to participate in the Hong Kong Round of Discussions, the Agreeement on Agriculture has to be very critically viewed. With these consideration, while I wish the hon. Minister 'all the best', the best' is in the failure of the Hong Kong Round of Discussions. Because, once the Hong Kong Round of Discussions succeeds, it will be irreversible. Something will come as irreversible on us. (*Interruptions*) please do not interrup. Therefore, personally, I wish let there be a grand failure of the Hong Kong Round of Discussions, as it had failed in Cancun, as it had failed in Seattle, as it had failed—virtually it had failed—in Doha. But it has been renamed as a Development Round. Therefore, so far as agriculture is concerned, there are many factors. My friend, Nilotpal Basu, has referred to non-tariff barrier. And, there are many distorting practices, many juggleries. And it is very difficult to cope up with these juggleries. India's position is quite unique. In fact, the Minister, in a private conversation, he accepted that India's position is quite unique.

India cannot be clubbed with.... In all the matters, G-20 cannot have one agreement. Or, G-5 also cannot have one agreement in all the matters. But, I am to request the hon. Minister to be very careful, so far as the Five Interesting Parties (FIPs) is concerned. Because, by participating in the FIPs, perhaps, our integrity, our credibility is being doubted by the developing countries, other developing countries, the least developed countries. I was going through these papers, it is very interesting that this Living Stone Agreement or Living Stone Policy, that has been envisaged by the least developed countries, or, the most backward countries. They are trying to push forward something what would also not be in our interest. So, we will have to exercise extreme caution. I am sorry, sometime I have to accept that the WTO has not served any purpose for the developing countries, for the huge population of almost 300 million. Almost 300 crores of people are languishing. And, Sir, it is a fact, which almost all the Members have pointed out, that after the WTO mechanism has come into being the prices of agricultural commodities have fallen below the envisaged level in almost all the developing countries.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Conclude please.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Yes, I am going to finish. I know that I will be under pressure. Please bear with me for sometime. This is a very important subject. This is for the first time that we are discussing this matter *pre facto*, usually we discuss it *post facto*. I must thank the hon. Minister that he has, at least, agreed to facilitate this discussion, whereby his position will be further strengthened.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Conclude please.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, kindly give me some more time. I have been waiting for a long time. Please give me some more time.

Sir, I was talking about agriculture. In agriculture, non-tariff barriers have to be very seriously looked into. These non-tariff barriers will become terribly trade-distorting in the days to come. And, the developed countries are not only subsidising more in the name of juggiery of green box, amber box, blue box at the same time, they are also using this non-tariff barriers very frequently to obstruct our exports... and, we shall not gain anything. This is number one.

Secondly, Sir, insofar as Mode-1 and Mode-4 are concerned, the hon. Minister has told that we shall get some advantage in Mode-4. What has happened in Mode-4? I would like to give you one instance, Sir. In H-1B Visa, the United States of America has not increased the number of visas. It is same; 65,000 or 69,000. The only thing is, they have added some categories. Some category of people, some category of professionals can go to America by enjoying this H-1B visa. What is that category? Sir, you will be astonished to know that this category is, fashion models. Only they can go to America, and this category will be allowed to have H-1B visa.This is to be noted that we are not getting anything. The professionals will go out and remain there. What professionals do they require? They will require professionlas like fashion designers and fashion models and for them they will be accommodating this H-1B visa. We have to be very careful, we are not going to gain much out of it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Shri Manoj Bhattacharya, please conclude.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: In this Mode-4, we are not going to gain much. So, I will say that in this NAMA, that is, Non Agriculture Market Access, we shall have to be very careful because it will lead to deindustrialisation. I am afraid, that in this NAMA, once we open our markets to the big multinational corporations we shall be indulging in further deindustrialisation. There is every possibility of that. As such our situation is very peculiar insofar as industrialisation is concerned. And, if we go for opening up the markets further, we shall be simply destabilising our industrial situation, whatever is there. Whatever advantages the small scale enterprises and medium scale enterprises are having today, those will also be destroyed. Therefore, in NAMA also, we shall have to exercise extreme caution because the commodities which we are producing will not be exported and the same commodities will be coming at cheaper rate to our country. I am not going to comment on dumping and anti-dumping etc. because you are not going to allow me. And, Sir, at the same time, I must say one or two words about TRIPS.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Thank you, Mr. Bhattacharya...(*Interruptions*)...We don't have much time. The hon. Minister has to reply also ...(*Interruptions*)...Mr. Bhattacharya, you must conclude in one minute, please...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I just want to make one point.

Sir, I am concluding. Insofar as TRIPS is concerned, we must go for review because when we were discussing the third amendment of the Patent Act, we were given to understand that this issue has to be fought internationally. Now, when international fight is there, when we are able to stage our fight internationally, we have got to remember this, because, Sir, for your kind information, the hon. Minister is , certainly, aware that so far as the human genes are concerned, 20 per cent of human genes have already been patented by America and it has been patented by one University; one very big multinational corporation. So, the bio-technological research that we are envisaging for, we are dreaming that we shall have a huge bio-technology research, but the basic material for bio-technology will not be available to us as far as genes are concerned. They are simply patented by American organisations. Therefore, the existence of WTO has widened the divide between the Northern hemisphere and the Southern hemisphere. However it may be said that the world is flat, the world is not flat, Sir, the world is wide open. We shall have to concentrate on this. We shall have to take this WTO negotiations in this light. I wish the hon. Minister all the best. I am sure, he will be able to effect a complete deadlock in the Hong Kong Round Ministerial discussions. Thank you very much, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Thank you, Mr. Bhattacharya. Now, Shri Ravula Chandra Sekar Reddy.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Sir. Finally, I have been called. Sir, I have a few apprehensions and a few suggestions to make on the statement made by the hon. Minister on the eve of the Hong Kong meeting scheduled to be held on 13-18 of this month.

Sir, my first apprehension is, we have not prepared the nation for the whole process of WTO and its consequences. Sir, as I am hearing the speeches from both the sides, it is not a blame game again. We are really concerned about the country and, more particularly, the farming community. Sir, the statement of the hon. Minister, basically, concentrates of three aspects. One is agriculture, the other is access to medicines at affordable prices to all, and the third one is services. Sir, coming to the agriculture, it has now become the most non-remunerative, and the farmers are committing suicides in various parts of our country. Sir, in the backdrop of our farming community being in real distress, the hon. Minister is going to participate in the deliberations at Hong Kong.

Sir, I would like to mention about the level-playing field. Our farmers are not in a position to compete with the farmers of developed countries. Our agriculture is, basically concentrated more in the rural areas and more than 90 per cent of the farming community is illiterate. Sir, our investments in agriculture are very high, whereas our yields are very, very low. The subsidies extended by the Governments, both at the State level and at the Central level are very meagre, whereas the developed countries are extending more subsidies to their farmers. For this reason, I am saying that it is not a level-playing field. Sir, as I understand, the deliberations which are dominated by the developed countries are detrimental to the interest of our farming community. Sir, the Quantitative and Qualitative Restrictions should not harm our faming community. The hon. Minister mentioned about the food security, livelihood security and rural development needs. These should be addressed carefully. Sir, you have assured that agriculture is not commence for vast majority of Indian farmers. It is a means of livelihood for millions of Indian farmers and their interests are to be fully protected. Sir, on the other hand, you are saying the efforts from the developed countries have so far been disappointing. The arrangements and agreements in pursuance of WTO should not harm the future of Indian farming community. Sir, as far as the medicines for all at affordable prices are concerned, most of the people who are living in rural areas are not having access to medical facilities. In the urban areas, now we are going in for speciality hospitals, super-speciality hospitals, and corporate hospitals, whereas 90 per cent of our population in the rural areas is still dependent on primary health centres of the Government. Sir, the people who are really engaged in pharmaceutical trade are selling their products at an exorbitant prices. Now and then we will be hearing that China rice has flooded the markets, China silk has come into Indian markets, and our farmers are not in a position to compete with them. So I would like to caution the hon. Minister to keep all the apprehensions in mind while negotiating at the table. He should stick to the statement made in this august House wherein he has boldly mentioned certain facts, which I appreciate. But, at the same, time, I would like to caution him that on the aspect of basmati rice, we are facing problem now. He did not mention about this in his statement. We have a Basmati Development Fund, in which there are about Rs. 1000 crores, if my remembrance goes well, earmarked for this purpose. Please take care of all these aspects while negotiating in Hong Kong.

Our best wishes are with you. Come out successfully. G-33, G-90, G-4 and G-20, all these things are there, but a common man in rural India is having high hopes on the hon. Minister and on the Government. In the light of his commitment, through this statement, we hope he will be successful. My best wishes are with him. Thank you.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am sorry that I was not present at the time the hon. Minister made his statement, because alongwith you, in another parliamentarians' were forum, we were speaking exactly on the subject of Ministerial Conference at Hong Kong of the WTO. However, I have carefully gone through the statement made by the hon. Minister, and what I am going to say is in the nature of wishing the Minister, on behalf of all the farmers of India, *bon voyage* firstly, and *bon courage* and lot of steel to your nerves' because you are going to face a very trying time. The first thing is, the picture is not as simple as it has been made out to be in the discussions here. During the days in Hong Kong, from early morning to late night, you are going to meet different groups. Groups of 20 is some sort of a comfort, but there are going to be group of 40, 90, 44 all numbers, the whole digital soup. And, it is not a question of putting forward the interests of Indian farmers and hoping that they will accept your position in sympathy and kindness. As Arun Jaitley said, the W.T.O. is; a big and tough bazaar. You get nothing, no free launches and nothing is given without getting something in exchange. Therefore, far more is involved by way of tactics, than by simple logic or the economics of the things. I would give you an advice that in the past months and particularly, in the last week or so, you have, probably, been loaded with data, figures, proposals counter proposals and amendments, and as Vivekananda said: 'just when the examination comes very close by, keep aside all the text books and start thinking what is it exactly that you want to achieve' and that would be the best way of preparing yourself for Hong Kong, hon. Minister, Sir.

I would like to put the problem at the Hong Kong in a particular situation, a historical situation. Because, there are people who advised you to get out of the W.T.O., particularly, the Agreement on Agriculture, and this is a subject on which there is a very curious convergence of all the rainbow colours, the reds and saffrons and the greens, all kinds of colours. Even the Gandhians have joined them to accuse W.T.O. for all kinds of

inequities and injustice. The Marrakesh Agreement was signed in 1995— it came into effect in 1995—and a lot of people say that Indian farmers have been put in a much worse condition after 1995 than they were ever before, and even the number of farmers' suicides is quoted in support of that. Now, I would say that this is far from the truth. There were, of course, others. At the other extreme, there is nobody who is going to tell you, or, who is going to advocate that whatever is decided at Hong Kong, you should accept and stick to the W.T.O. because we have been an old member of the GATT and, because it, in our interest, we can't leave the W.T.O. therefore, stick to that. I think, it is important to remember that the whole world is going through various waves of protectionism and liberalism. We had firstly an epoch on mercantilism which was replaced by the *laissez faire* economics which was, later on, replaced, under Hitler, by Dr. Schacht's 'Beggar buy neighbour policies in trade', which resulted in the Second World War, and when the World War was over and the fathers of the United Nations came together at Los Angeles, they decided that openness of trade is very important prevention for world peace and, therefore, even though no kind of an agreement was reached on the trade pattern after the World War, the GATT was created as a sort of a torum, as a sort of a Trade for having negotiations which finally came to the Uruguay Round. I would not go into those details, and then we had the Marrakesh Agreement, the Doha Round, and we have now the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference.

The agriculture since it was introduced was always a subject of serious disputes and even at Hong Kong, as you have said in your own statement, Mr. Minister, agriculture is going to be the major bone of contention.

What happens in case of the intellectual Property Rights? What happens in the case of several other issues is something that can be corrected. But the very survival of WTO depends on what progress we achieve in respect of the conditionalities that were accepted in the Marrakesh Agreement about the access conditions, about export subsidies and the domestic support.

Now, the Indian farmers were very happy about the fact that we joined WTO, for the simple reason that in India we were in a very peculiar situation. Mr. Arun Jaitely has said just now that the world is divided between two sorts of countries—countries that subsidise and countries

that don't subsidise. India happens to be an almost unique case where the farmers have suffered under negative subsidies, or negative AMS for long, long years. This is a country where the dumping was done, not by foreign competitions, but by our own Governments. We purchased wheat at a higher price, brought it to India and sold it at lower prices. We ourselves banned the export of agriculture commodities. For example, we banned the export of onions, when the farmers could have got a better price. All the inequities that the WTO is supposed to cure, were imposed in India by its own national Government and the farmers thought that WTO would provide a great relief from the inequities of agricultural policy in India.

Now, if one does not realise that Indian farmers have suffered from the negative subsidies, then they would not realise what the whole WTO is about and why is it that we support WTO at all. I have it on the authority of the Commerce Minister himself that we continue to be, unlike what Mr. Jaitley said, under a regime of negative subsidies even today. I had it in the Commerce Consultative Committee from the Minister himself.

Now, what are we going to do? What kind of strategies would be adopted? I am going to be very short and simple, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Firstly, are you really expecting that the Hong Kong Ministerial would not be the conclusive round and that ther would be actually antoher round sometime in the next year? Then, your strategy, Mr. Minister, would be quite different. Then, you have ample scope for making threatening noises and taking postures. But, if you think that much more than that would actually happen at Hong Kong, then the lie that you have to take would be briefly this.

The Indian farmers do not expect any kind of subsidies from the Government. Indian farmers have suffered under negative subsidies for a long time and they are happy about WTO, for the simple reason that they think that it is the only instrument which can bring down the level of subsidies in the United States, in Europe, Japan and other rich countries. That is why, we are with the WTO. If the subsidies have not actually been reduced, then we should not lose hope, Mr. Minister, for the simple reason that if we did not have WTO, if we did not have the Marrakesh Agreement, then we will have Super 301 and Special 301

under which the Americans could dictate their terms and impose their conditionalities on us. At least, thanks to the WTO, we have some kind of an instrument by which we galvanize the world opinion in order to make the Americans, the Japanese and the Europeans bring down their subsidies.

The important thing is that there is a very strong lobby. Now, there are, in fact, three lobbies working in the rich countries, which is very important to remember. There is a consumers' lobby, which also gets taxed because of the subsidies to agriculture, in America, in Europe and in Japan. There is a tax payers' lobby, which is unhappy about the taxes collected from them are used for agricultural subsidies. Much more than that, there is a real tiller farmers's lobby in the USA and in Europe. Most of these subsidies go to the corporate farmers and not to the ordinary farmers, who, even in America, are in as bad a condition as the Indian farmers are. So, these lobbies are working for you. This very morning, Mr. Minister, you must have read that the sugar subsidies are to be slashed by the European countries and cotton subsidies are also to be slashed by the United States, not voluntarily, but because of pressure, and because of the suits that was filed by Brazil.

Now, what is important is not so much what you agree upon there. What is more important is what do we do to reverse the iniquitous agricultural policies in India. That is a work, which you will have to do after you come back. You have not given the details.

But the problem lies not with the WTO conditionality, but with the fact that we have handled our own agriculture. So, I wish you a good journey; I wish you a lot of courage and I wish you good luck. Thank you, very much

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): I just want to make a suggestion that all the people who are going to create problems for the Minister when he comes back after the Hong Kong Ministerial meeting, I request him to take all of them to Hong Kong. I would request him to take Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi; I would request him to take Shri Nilotpal Basu, my friend, Shri Manoj Bhattacharya to Hong Kong.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): He will need a chartered flight.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: He should take all of them to Hong Kong so

that when he comes back and we have a discussion on the subject on the 20th, we will have a more informed debate.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: I recommend this. ... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): We will take Mr. Pany also there. ....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. Members for their suggestions, for the caution and the inputs — wide — ranging inputs and wide-ranging suggestions — which have been given before the Hong Kong Ministerial meeting which was supposed to lead to full modalities. But as I have said in my text, the convergence on most of the issues to day is far away. Sir, I am happy that we have been able to discuss a subject which, I think, is the most crucial for India, not only the most crucial for India but also the most crucial for the developing countries, and which at the same time, is the most structually flawed in world trade, and that is agriculture. There is no doubt today that the structural flaw in agriculture trade arises from a completely unlevel-paying field. Today when we talk of the WTO, the WTO is not merely about free trade, it is about fair trade and fair trade means a level-playing field. But in the case of agriculture, is it anywhere near fair; is it anywhere near level-playing field with the developed countries—as all the hon. Members have said—with subsidies of one billion dollars a day? If any developed country or any single person expects that one billion dollar a day is going to compete with three hundred million people with less than one dollar a day in India, then that is the biggest absurdity. Sir, agriculture flaws arise from domestic support and the export subsidies given by the developed countries and their ability to do so. It is not that we do not want to give subsidy to our farmers. We are limited by our budgetary constraints. Six hundred and fifty million people in this country are dependent on subsistence farming with land-holding patterns of one hectare or one-and-a-half hectares. Agriculture in India is not commerce, as we always say that. And can it ever be commerce if our agriculture pattern has to be this? On the other hand, we find that in the United States 47 per cent of the US price of cotton is subsidy. As Sharad Joshiji was saying that there are different kinds of farmers, they are not farmers, they are corporations masquerading as farmers. So, we have discussed agriculture here and

our concerns in agriculture. Our concerns are common. After all, we all represent people in some form or the other. That is what brought us here. And no one is oblivious to the fact that the Indian farmer is the most disadvantaged in the world today. So, of course, we have to ensure that the export subsidies, which are there in the frame work Agreement of July, have to be eliminated. What we are negotiating is the date. We have to have specificity in the date. There cannot be any agreement. There cannot be any agreement that will be an open-ended agreement for export subsidies. The domestic support given by the developed countries, the Doha mandate is for substantial reduction. We must see this substantial reduction. If there is no substantial reduction, there cannot be any agreement. We are not concerned with the completion of this round; we are concerned with the content of this round. This is the Doha Development Round. It is not that it is called the Doha Development Round because no other word was found. It is not that is is called the Doha development Round because it was an accident. It is very, very deliberate and unless the content of this round is development, the completion has no meaning. And, I have stated it very categorically. I have stated it categorically in various meetings. When they say there is no convergence, there is nothing wrong that there is no convergence because India has taken a view of opposition. It is very easy to have a convergence; it is very easy to agree. It is very difficult to disagree. So, Sir, we have also to look at it. When Dr. Joshi was talking about the Marrakesh Agreement, he said that the Marrakesh Agreement was not discussed. Sir, also we need to look at certain facts. What has happened in the last ten years? We cannot runaway from these facts. These facts are there. It was a policy of the then Government, followed by subsequent Governments. I am not going into the right or wrong of it. May be, Mr. Joshi feels that it was wrong, may be some feel that it was right, and, may be my friends feel that it was absolutely wrong but there are certain facts that cannot be put under the table. What are those facts? What were our merchandise exports in 1995, and, what are they today? I am not giving these figures just to mislead the House. What was our share of trade? What were the figures of agricultural exports in 1995? What are the figures of agricultural exports today? What were the figures in the services exports in 1995. I have got them all here. So, just by one sweep of the brush, we cannot form an opinion. Our merchandise exports in 1995 were 30

million. This year, we hope to hit 92 billion. That is what our exports are going to be. Sir, our world share is going up. In 1995, what it was and, now, what is it this year. Similarly, our exports in agriculture were 6.3 billion dollars, and, in 2004, it was 67.3 billion dollars.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: What was our share of trade in 1947 just after we became independent? What was the share in 1990 and what is the share today?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Dr. Sahib, we are talking..(*Interruptions*)

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: You are talking of 10 years; our share has gone down. And, even now you are trying to say that you will reach one per cent or more than one per cent. What are you saying?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: You started with the Marrakesh Agreement, so I also started with the Marrakesh Agreement. Did you not start with the Marrakesh Agreement?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Yes, I did.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: So, I am also giving you the figures after the Marrakesh Agreement. If you had started from 1947, I would have ...(*Interruptions*)... I am not saying you are wrong.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: You said what were the exports at the time of Marrakesh Agreement. I say, what were your exports in 1948, and, what was your share of trade after independence. How did it come to that just before the Marrakesh Agreement? It is because it was going down, and, it is still going down. You are talking in billions, talk in percentages.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, as I said, since you started your debate with the Marrakesh Agreement, I also started with the Marrakesh Agreement. (*Interruptions*) Let me finish. I have got your point. If you had started off from 1947, we have to look at it in that context.

But, anyway, since your point was that the Marrakesh Agreement was such a wrong step. This is what happened. We need to look at the facts. "It could have been better", may be your point. I am not getting into that. But we are getting into an issue that this is what the figures show.

What happened in the services exports? In 1995, our services exports were 6.76 billion and what is the figure in 2004. It is almost 40 billion, more

than six times. This is also a fact. So, we have to look at these facts also when we are going to negotiate. We cannot put these facts under the table when we are negotiating.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

So, looking at these facts, what do we have to ensure? That is what I want to tell my friends here. What do we have to look at? What do we have to see? What is our objective?

Our objective is to see that in agriculture, the subsidised exports do not displace our farmers, do not cause distress to our farmers, because this subsidy leads to an artificiality of prices. So, on one side, we are offensively hit by the subsidy given by the developed countries; on the other side, our farmers have to compete with an artificial price, if they want to export, because, there is an artificiality of prices which is there. It is not that the Indian farmers cannot compete with the US farmers. But, the Indian farmer has to compete then with the US Government. He is not competing with the US farmers. So, the subsidy of one billion dollars a day is given by the developed countries which has really caused the greatest distortion in trade and a distortion in trade which affects most of all, most of all, the poorest of the poor countries. This is the great challenge we have before us in this round, that to what extent, this great structural flow which we have in agriculture, we will be able to correct. That is the biggest challenge. Undoubtedly, we had the July Framework. Dr. Joshi said that this is not strong enough. I beg to differ with you Dr. Saheb, because, for the first time, we brought in this concept of special products, which are contingent, which are related to livelihood security. We brought in the special safeguard mechanisms. These are all contained in the July Framework. And, I can only assure you—you said, "Don't get pressurised"—that we are not goint to get pressurised, I am not going to get pressurised. If we had to be pressurised, there would not be such wide convergence up till now. That is why there is such a wide convergence. Everybody has said we must make Hong Kong a success. And, I have very clearly said that I am concerned with the content of it, not the completion of it. I want to see the content. If the content does not give India a market access, my farmers a market access, we are looking for market access, do not we export our basmati

rice; do not we export our marine products; do we not our spices, do we not export so many things? How do this six billion, seven billion dollars of exports come. We still want market access. But I cannot compete when the prices are artificial. At the same time, I want to protect the onslaught of the inequity of the agriculture products, the total inequity. They are not talking of trade flows; they are talking of subsidy flows. That is what we are going to oppose and see that structurally agriculture in international trade is correct. So far as ware goods are concerned, of course, we are concerned. We want greater access. Today, whan we say that we are going to export 92 or 95 billion dollars or close to 100 billion dollars, this represents what—the incremental economic activity in this country. I have got a study done by the RIS that between 2004 and 2005, the merchandise exports we had, what employment did it generate—a 20 per cent increase. It generated 10 lakh additional jobs and goods which are exported are not absorbed in the Indian economy. So, it is an incremental economic activity. So, for us, we need market access also. On the other hand, if we are globally competitive, we are not afraid. Why should we undermine our people? Why should we undermine our industry? Today, when we are large exporters, we have got great strength and services, Mr. Basu mentioned that we have given away in services. Let me assure him that it is not that we are looking for visas alone; the H-1B visa is not the alone issue. Today what is the future in IT-enabled services? A lot of business is being lost becauase we cannot take contracts which have maintenance because it is a short-term, one month, two months, if they got to go for maintenance. They got to go for after-sale-service. ...(*Interruptions*). Let me finish please. So, what we need to be is aggressive in services. What is the economic architecture of the future? The economic architecture of the future is what we are going to see and the economic architecture of the future is going to be with the young population in India versus an aging population in Europe, an aging population in Japan, an aging population in United States and in China also. They will be needing us. (*Interruptions*).

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: The United States is the youngest out of them. That is the ....(*Interruptions*) We are. Out of those countries, which he has mentioned, namely, Europe, Japan and the United States, the United States is not bothered about ageing; their total number is less.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Dr. Joshi, I draw your attention to a very interesting study. I will tell you from where I have got this. You could perhaps have a look at it. It is the McKinsey Study on Ageing Population. They have done it country-wise and studied the global economic impact of the young population. This is what they have done. The fact of the matter is that we have to look at greater market access in services. Of course, there is a negotiating point that you have told me and I want to correct you that we have not offered 74 per cent in the Telecom Sector; we have only offered 49 per cent. I said in some areas we offered bound rate. Anyway, I just want to clarify it.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: That point is meaningless. You have already liberalised up to 74 per cent. That is the point that I have been making.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: But I am not binding it. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: If you are getting that option domestically, that could become a real bargaining count, which you have eroded.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: No. It still is, because I have not agreed to bind. And as long as I have not agreed to bind it, it is not a legal commitment. Today, in my offers, of course, if I am going to ask them, they will ask me what I am going to give them. I want to assure you all that what we are going to give is going to generate more economic activity; we are not going to give which is going to displace our people; we are going to give which suits our economy, which suits our growth, which generates employment, creates economic activity. That is the objective which we have. There are various concerns, which have been talked of like taking out the Agreement on Agriculture from the WTO. We are living in a real world I can go and say this. Does it hold water? There are 148 counties. what happens if no country stands behind us on these issues? There is a concern today as to what coalitions we have built. There was a concern expressed as to why we are members of the FIPS. We are not members of the FIPS. I represent the G-20; India represents the G-20 in the FIPS. G-20 is a very powerful voice. Mr. Arun Jaitley was saying so. And it started when he was the Minister and I give him full credit for it. He started it in Cancun when he was the Minister. We strengthened it. It has just started then. In G-33, India is a very major player. I myself chaired the meeting of G-33. In G-90, when India speaks, India does not speak alone for itself; it speaks for all the developing countries. India

speaks for the LDCs; India speaks for the vulnerable economies. And that is what makes India's voice the loudest. That is what we will continue to do and that is what we will do in Hong Kong, because people are looking at India, which has the largest number of the poor people in the world. There may be small countries in the world, which has poor people, but, of course, our numbers are much larger. So, people are looking at India and, please, have no concern on this. I hosted the G-20 meeting here: I invited the LDC coordinator. I myself participated in the G-90 meeting. I myself participated in the ACP (Africa, Caribbean and Pacific) meeting. That is right. That is what you subjected me too. But the fact is this that India today is recognised as raising the voice and we will continue to raise the voice of all the developing countries and that will hold us in good stead.

There were some very specific points made about the de *minimis* cut. The *de minimis* cut is the amount given by the Government; the subsidy. I don't want to sound technical. is really what is permitted, It is not related to trade; it is related to rural development; it is related to poverty. Today, we are consuming very little of our *de minimis*, and let me be very clear that there can be agreement. I am not even willing to accept a demand to reduce our *de minimis*. Forget about reducing it. There is no question of reducing our demand of *de minimis*. Dr. Sahab, you will understand it because you understand the subject well.

There is no question of our reducing the *de minimus*, in any way. Similar is the case with the special and different treatment. There can be no compromise in respect of the special and differential treatment. The special and differential treatement is all permeating, and less than full reciprocity principle will be maintained. There can be no compromise on that . There is no divergence between what everybody in the House is saying, and what we have been saying. Certainly, I may differ with some of my friends who said, bring on QRs. Now, QRs is in the WTO legal framework. It can only be brought in with regards to the the balance of payments position. I may say that our balance of payments position is not bad today, is not a negative position. I cannot just start talking pf QRs. But I want to assure you one thing. What do we mean by a special safeguards mechanism? The special safeguards mechanism is a kind of Qr. We brought that in. So, there are a large number of safeguards which will save us from any kind of onslaughts, and we are going to stand by this;

we are going to be firm on this. There is no question of our slipping on this.

An issue was raised that we are giving an impression that we are largely with the developed countries . Please be sure that we are engaging everybody; India is a country which is going to engage everybody. But when it comes to standing by, we are going to stand with the developed countries; we will stand with the least-developed countries. But that does not stop us from engaging ourselves with the other countries because, they understand our position. We have communicated to them last week in Geneva at the G-4 meeting. I told the United States of America, I told the European Union that I want to start with the least-development countries; I want to start the discussion with what are we going to do far them. What are we going to do with those where there is a preference erosion? What are we going to do with the vunerable economies? One-and-a-half days were spent in discussing that because, these countries also depend on India, and immediately, they are in touch with me on the telephone; they are in touch with me for the last on month very consistently. So, we are not, in any way, giving a wring signal. I think, the singnal of India is correct, and in the next 10 days, you will be able to see that. Then, there is an issue of TRIPs, CBDT and public health. India is country which has pushed the hardest for biodiversity and bio-piracy. Certainly, we will see to it that it is not pushed aside. On the issue of TRIPs an public health, of course, we are going to stand by our African friends we are arriving at a tent we will only accept a text which our African friends are going at a text. What our African friends will accept, we will only accept. That is what we are going to do because, in the end, it is a question of reaching the medicines to them, it is a question of compulsory licensing for those countries. It is not just a question over whcih we are going to gloss over which do not even concern us. Sir, Shri Manoj Bhattacharya said that he hopes that the round will not fail. He need not give us an advice. I take advice, and it is well taken. But he must understand that obviously, it will fail if they think that they can pressurise India; obviously it will fail if we do not get an access into the market; obviously, this round will fail if they hope that their subsidised agricultural products are going to flood the Indian markets; obviously, this round will fail if they are going to think that they will displace the poor farmers of this country, and if that is the way it goes on, of course, it will fail. I have no hesitation in saying that because, it is very important.

Today, the state of the Indian economy plays a very important role in the state of the global economy. Let us not forget this. This is a fact of life today. The role of the Indian economy in the global economy is very large, and I think, it is important for the developed countries to recognise it, and the developed countries are recognising this fact that if the state of the global economy is to be kept healthy, the Indian economy must also remain healthy. This is a great change which has taken place all these years. Sir, I am thankful to Mr. Reddy. He raised the issue of GIs and basmati rice. I presume he was saying that. Yes, GI is another issue. We are finding countries, which are saying that basmati rice and Darjeeling tea are produced in Vietnam, or, basmati rice is produced in some other country. We are taking up the issue to see that the geographical indications are respected, and we have a satisfactory agreement in GIs.

Sir, Joshiji, with all his knowledge on WTO and his incisive comments, has made a very different analysis. He has made a very different analysis because he is saying that one problem lies in here and the next problem lies in there. Maybe, he is true. But I want to assure him only that 'yes',—he said, "the challenge is there." and he also said, "I should keep all the figures away and do what I think is right." —I will do half of that. I will do both the things; I will do what I think is right, and will continue to look at the figures also. I want to also mention that our colleague, Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi, has made a very good analysis of how the agricultural prices have changed, how the agricultural prices have seen a change which has taken place. This is a fact. My friend from Kerala in the other House was mentioning about pepper, caradamom and vanilla; these are not grown in the United States. Tea, coffee, these are also not grown in the United States and the European Union. We are seeing that other developing countries have become big producers. Today, the tea prices are going down. We are having growth in production in Kenya, in Vietnam, in Sri Lanka. If you are seeing cardamom, we are seeing Gautemala. We are seeing pepper in Vietnam. We are competing with the United States and the European Union, with the developed countries in this. If we really look at this Agreement as an Agreement which has got to be shaped in terms of the new economic architecture of the future because there is a complete paradigm shift from the Uruguay Round, we are not the same country which we were at the Uruguay Round. We are, today,

economically much more strong. Today, our foreign exchange reserves are there. We have to see how we have to utilise this. Today, it is our engagement in the global economy of 300 billion dollars, which is making the world look at India. I want to, in conclusion, only assure our farmers, through every Member in this House, that our Government is a Government which stands by the 650 million farmers of the country, that our Government is a Government which stands by the youth who are looking, as a young nation, for employment opportunities, and that any agreement we enter into, if at all, will be an agreement which will only enhance and enlarge the economic activities to create employment, which will enhance and enlarge the position, the economic position, of the farmers because that is our biggest challenge. The biggest challenge is our agricultural farmers. The biggest challenge is our youth. It is these two challenges we keep in mind, and with these two challenges, with all your good wishes, I will go to Hong Kong. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Statement to be made by Mr. Vaghela.

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: उपसभापति जी, एक मिनट। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति: चलिए।

श्री जय राम रमेश: हो गया, सर। एक घंटे का भाषण आपका हो गया। ...(व्यवधान)

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: जरा सुन लीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)... क्या परेशानी है आपको? हम आह भी भरते हैं, तो हो जाते हैं बदनाम। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री जयराम रमेश: परेशानी है। ...(*Interruptions*)... I have sat throughout the entire debate. You gave your lecture, you went out and you came at the end! ...(*Interruptions*)...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Just a minute. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I have sat throughout the entire debate. ...(*Interruptions*)... I have sat throughout the entire debate unlike you. ...(*Interruptions*)...

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: मिस्टर मिनिस्टर, एक ही दरख्वास्त है आपसे, अभी जब आप प्रेस के लोगों को ब्रीफ कर रहे थे, तो किसी की गलती से हो, आपके वहां भारत का झंडा उलटा लगा था, जो भारत का झंडा वहां आपकी मेज पर रखा हुआ था, वह उलटा था। मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि जब आप हांगकांग में रहें तो भारत का झंडा सीधा रखें और ऊंचा रखें।

श्री कमल नाथ: हम ऊंचा रखेंगे। यह शिक्षा और ज्ञान हम आपसे नहीं चाहते।

डा॰ मुरली मनोहर जोशी: नहीं, मैं सिर्फ यह इसलिए कह रहा हूं, जाने से पहले आप जितना जोर से आश्वासन दे रहे हैं, मैं सिर्फ आपसे दरख्वास्त कर रहा हूं कि भारत का झंडा सीधा रखें और ऊंचा रखें।

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour

THE MINISTER OF TEXTILES (SHRI SHANKERSINH VAGHELA): Sir, I beg to lay a Statement on the Table of the House regarding the status of implementation of the recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour on Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Ministry of Textiles.

Sir, I also lay herewith the status report in respect of these recommendations on the Table of the House.

श्री उपसभापति: मंत्री जी, यह स्टेटमेंट आप ले कर दीजिए। The House is adjourned till 11.00 a.m. on Thursday, the 8th December, 2005.

The House then adjourned at five minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 8th December, 2005.

MGIPMRND—5213RS—04.05.2006.